

The finest tribute ever accorded to sterling merit is contained in THE LANCET, of August 8, 1891, pages 807-8, which embodies the "Report of THE LANCET Special Commission on Natural Mineral Waters," "Johannis"—the subject of the Report—being selected from amongst the Natural Mineral Waters of the world as worthy of this distinction.

PROMOTES APPETITE. ASSISTS DIGESTION. PROLONGS LIFE

"JOHANNIS."

THE KING OF NATURAL TABLE WATERS.

CHARGED ENTIRELY WITH ITS OWN NATURAL GAS.

To be obtained from all Chemists, Wine Merchants, and Stores at the following prices per Dozen delivered:—

London	Bottles. 1-Bottles.	1-Bottles.	Country	Bottles. 1-Bottles.	1-Bottles.
6/-	4/6	3/6	6/6	5/-	3/0

Springs:

ZOLLHAUS, GERMANY.

London Office:

25, REGENT STREET, S.W.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED OVER HALF A CENTURY.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,
SIMPLE,

THE
PERFECTED SYSTEM
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.

AND
SECURE.

TOTAL ASSETS, £2,692,000. INCOME, £303,000.

The Yearly New Business exceeds ONE MILLION.

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. Lord HALSBURY.

The Right Hon. Lord COLERIDGE, The Lord Chief Justice.

The Hon. Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.

The Right Hon. Sir JAMES PARKER DEANE, Q.C., D.C.L.

FREDERICK JOHN BLAKE, Esq.

WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS.....	161	LAW SOCIETIES	167
THE DOCTRINE OF "DEABLE V. HALL" 163		LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	167
THE ORIGINATING SUMMONS NOT "INTER PARTES"	164	LEGAL NEWS	167
REVIEWS	168	COURT PAPERS	168
CORRESPONDENCE	168	WINDING UP NOTICES	174
NEW ORDERS, &c.	168	CREDITORS' NOTICES.....	174
		BAKERS' NOTICES.....	175

PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES.

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Weekly Reporter.

Attorney-General v. St. John's Hospital, Bath	172
Bagot's Settlement, In re, Bagot v. Kittoe	170
Bartholomay Brewing Co. (of Rochester) (Limited) v. Wyatt (Surveyor of Taxes); Nobel Dynamite Trust Co. (Limited) v. Wyatt (Surveyor of Taxes)	173
Borough Commercial and Building Society, In re	161
Oliver v. Housham Local Board; Thompson v. Mayne and Corporation of Brighton	161
Reg. v. Wolfenstau	176
Solt v. Ashwell	165
Tyson, In re, Knight-Bruce v. Butterworth	172

VOL. XXXVIII., No. 11.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, JANUARY 13, 1894.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE NAMES and dates of call to the bar of the new Queen's Counsel are as follows:—Mr. MATTHEW S. GROSVENOR WOODS, 1865; and Mr. AUGUSTINE BIRRELL, M.P., 1875.

IT IS UNDERSTOOD that Mr. GROSVENOR WOODS, Q.C., will practise before Mr. Justice STIRLING.

WE ARE GLAD to hear on the best authority that Lord Esher is practically convalescent, but at the same time we learn that his medical attendant forbids his lordship to attend and take his seat in court at present.

IN COURT of Appeal No. 1 Queen's Bench final appeals and new trial motions will be taken in alternate weeks during the present sittings, beginning probably on the 15th of January with new trial motions.

MR. JUSTICE WRIGHT began again on the first day of the sittings to take up the work of Mr. Justice VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, and will, it may be presumed, continue that work so long as Mr. Justice VAUGHAN WILLIAMS is absent on circuit.

ON THE FIRST day of the present sittings Lord HALSBURY was unexpectedly unable to be present in Court of Appeal No. 1, but by great good fortune there was enough interlocutory business to occupy a considerable portion of the day, so that no time was wasted, the other two judges, Lord Justice SMITH and Lord Justice DAVEY, forming a sufficient court for that class of appeals.

A NOTICE is issued that, in consequence of the limited Chancery Appeal List, the arrangement for taking interlocutory appeals from the Chancery and Probate and Divorce Divisions on Wednesdays during the present sittings, and Chancery final appeals on all other days, in Court of Appeal No. 2, will be subject to modifications, of which due notice will appear in the daily cause list.

ON A MOTION on Thursday, before Mr. Justice CHITTY, for leave to serve a writ out of the jurisdiction, the learned judge announced that order 11 of the Rules of November, 1893, had been annulled by the Rule Committee, and that another order had been made temporarily restoring order 11 of the rules of 1883. His lordship also observed that these applications should be made in chambers where the fiat was simply indorsed on the writ, whereas on a motion the expense of drawing up an order was incurred. Since the above was written, we have been favoured with a copy of the new rule made by the Rule Committee which we print elsewhere.

WE UNDERSTAND that upon one point the new rules as to originating summonses are causing some friction in the Central Office. Many summonses of the class "not inter partes" are as *parte*. The forms prescribed are not easily adaptable to such cases. But we do not anticipate that much difficulty will be experienced in providing a remedy. All that would seem to be required is a special form to meet the case of a summons to which no appearance is required to be entered, together with a rule containing some provision, in lieu of that prescribed by ord. 54, r. 4b, which will enable the applicant to obtain an appointment so soon as his summons has been issued.

THE COMMITTEE stage of the Local Government Bill ended upon Tuesday night, and the labours of the Lower House upon this difficult subject are almost at an end. The last two nights in committee were chiefly occupied with the discussion of the new clause which provides for the compulsory hiring of land for allotments. The clause has been passed with some modifications designed to protect owners from having pasture lands broken up and returned upon their hands in a depreciated condition at the termination of the hiring, and from being obliged to grant leases for allotments for the short period of seven years, which was originally proposed. On the report stage of the Bill fresh attempts are being made to provide for the direct payment of the rate for parish expenses by the parochial electors who will have the control of that expenditure. Up to the present these attempts have been successfully resisted, but if some such provision were accepted, one of the most serious blots upon the measure—the handing over of the expenditure of funds to a class many members of which will not contribute to them—would be removed.

WE HAVE already (*ante*, pp. 108, 109) discussed very fully in these columns the effect upon procedure which is introduced by ord. 31, r. 2, as amended by R. S. C., November, 1893. We have not hesitated to express our opinion that the rule which requires interrogatories to be "settled" by the judge will entail upon the court an altogether unnecessary burden, and will be productive of much needless delay and expense to the suitors. To one point, however, we failed to give sufficient prominence. The rule requires that "the particular interrogatories to be delivered shall be submitted to the judge." This will necessitate the expense of having the interrogatories prepared before the hearing of the application for leave to deliver them. It is obvious that there may be cases in which the judge may think it wholly unnecessary that interrogatories should be delivered at all. Why the cost of preparing interrogatories should be incurred when they may be disallowed *en bloc* we are at a loss to understand. It is certainly possible that this may be due to the fact that we are so obtuse as to be unable to fathom the reasons which have induced the Rule Committee to sanction a step so reactionary as this rule. We believe we are only expressing the universal feeling of the profession in recording our conviction that it forms the most palpable blot on the new procedure.

WE DREW attention last week to what is probably the most curious piece of criticism which the new Rules of Court have yet received—viz., the suggestion that the form of indorsement to an originating summons, stating that a defendant *may* appear, is wrong, because ord. 54, r. 4c, says that parties served *shall* enter an appearance. As we pointed out then, the rule does not even put the case as strongly as the reviewer suggests. In any case it is absurd to suppose that any rule of court can deprive a party of his right, in the exercise of his free will, to make default in appearance. If he is obstinate enough, or foolish enough, or (it may be) wise enough, to insist on not entering an appearance, who shall say him nay? We now offer this point for the consideration of the learned author to whom we are indebted for this remarkable comment, that if his criticism were of any value at all, it comes nearly twenty years too late. What is wrong in the case of an originating summons cannot be right in the case of a writ. In order 12 (which deals with the subject of appearance generally) the expression that a defendant *shall* appear is used more than once. The forms of writ given in Appendix A. to R. S. C., 1883, contain a notice to the defendant in precisely similar terms to that in the new form of originating summons. Order and form alike date back to R. S. C., 1875.

TWO QUESTIONS of some interest were raised in the case of the prisoner NODOT, whose extradition was demanded by the French Government on a charge of alleged larceny within the jurisdiction of the Republic. It was contended that under our extradition treaty with France a prisoner arrested on a provisional warrant (1) cannot be admitted to bail, and (2) cannot

be released before the expiration of the fourteen days within which the French Government is entitled to send over depositions in support of its application for extradition. Sir JOHN BRIDGE rejected both contentions, and we cannot doubt that he did so correctly. As regards the question of bail, it would clearly be unjust that a prisoner should be detained in custody when (the state of matters, for instance, in the NODOT case) the prosecutor declined to come forward. There is, of course, a good deal of speciousness in the argument that if bail is to be allowed in an extradition case, a prisoner may choose to forfeit his recognizances to the Crown and escape altogether. But magistrates will not be too ready to accept bail in such cases, and it would certainly be undesirable that the matter should be removed from their discretion. The contention that a person once arrested for extradition cannot be discharged for fourteen days was neatly disposed of by Sir JOHN BRIDGE. Suppose, said the learned magistrate in effect, that JONES is arrested for SMITH, and that the mistake is patent and admitted. Must JONES be kept in gaol for a fortnight? The very statement of such a proposition refutes it. *Omnis definitio*, it hath been said by them of old time, *in jure periculosa est*. But whether we accept this maxim or reject it, there can be no doubt that Sir JOHN BRIDGE did wisely in declining to affirm as a general principle of law a doctrine which lent itself so easily to a *reductio ad absurdum*.

THE CASE of *Re Sudeley and Baines & Co.'s Contract* (reported *ante*, p. 128) is an interesting addition to the line of cases shewing the conditions under which a power of sale that is not expressly limited to a period within that prescribed by the rule against perpetuities is held to be valid and exercisable. The trustees of a will, having the legal estate, had offered for sale some land, subject to the trust, under a general power of sale given them by the will. On investigation of the title it was found that the life interests had determined shortly before the sale, and that the estate was absolutely vested in the beneficiaries in fee. The purchasers objected that the trustees could not make a title under the power. The estate was ultimately divisible into a great number of shares. The general law on the subject is stated by JESSEL, M.R., to be that such "powers, although framed in general terms, are limited by the nature of the limitations contained in the settlement or will," so that when the absolute interests come into existence the power is considered to be at an end (*Peters v. Lewis and East Grinstead Railway Co.*, 29 W. R. 874, 18 Ch. D. 429), and he referred to *Lantsbery v. Collier* (4 W. R. 826, 2 K. & J. 709), where Wood, V.C., carefully considered the authorities. But the power of sale in the case of *Peters v. Lewis & Co., Railway Co.* was given expressly "for the purpose of division," and the doctrine of *Lantsbery v. Collier* did not appear to JESSEL, M.R., to apply to a case where the power was to take effect on the coming into existence of the absolute limitations. He thought that the power of sale did not determine on the death of the tenant for life, but might (though it was decided, in fact, not to) have been exercised *within a reasonable time* afterwards for the purpose of dividing the property. Though there was no express limit of time, the trustees were bound to make a division within a reasonable time, and therefore the power of sale was also limited in the nature of the case to a reasonable time, and no one would say that twenty-one years was a reasonable time. Thus, the fact that the trustees were obliged (not in the nature of things or by positive law, but by the rules of equity) to exercise the power well within the legal period, was sufficient, in the view of JESSEL, M.R., to make the power in *Peters' case* valid under the rule against perpetuities. In the absence of the necessity for a decision on the point, the other members of the court (BRETT and COTTON, L.J.J.) declined to express an opinion. It is observable that, though *Lantsbery v. Collier* stops short with the consideration of cases where the object of the settlement is at an end as soon as the fee vests in possession, the *ratio decidendi* appears to have been that "the court will look to the whole intent and purpose of the settlement in order to extend the exercise of the power to the objects of the settlement" (2 K. & J., at p. 726). And that the objects of a settlement do not necessarily end with the vesting of the fee is well shewn

by the judgment of FRY, J., in *Re Cotton's Trustees and School Board for London* (30 W. R. 610, 19 Ch. D. 624), where it was held that the question was always one of the settlor's or deviser's intention. There was considerable resemblance between the circumstances there and those in *Re Sudeley*, except that the power of sale in *Cotton's case* was duly restricted as to time. In *Re Sudeley* the invalidity of the power was insisted on first as infringing the rule against perpetuities; and next, whether so infringing or not, as having expired with the vesting of the absolute interests under the will. CHITTY, J., held, on the construction of the will, that the power of sale was intended to be exercised after the determination of the life estates for the purposes of division. Having so held, his lordship easily disposed of the first point in accordance with the dictum of JESSEL, M.R., in *Peters' case*, with which he concurred; and then, applying *Re Cotton's Trustees*, held that the power was still subsisting in the view which he took of the will.

"THE QUESTION," said Lord CRANWORTH in *Ware v. Lord Egmont* (4 De G. M. & G. 473), "when it is sought to affect a purchaser with constructive notice, is not whether he had the means of obtaining, and might by prudent caution have obtained, the knowledge in question, but whether the not obtaining it was an act of gross or culpable negligence." Under the Conveyancing Act, 1882, s. 3 (1), the rule has taken the form that the "purchaser shall not be prejudicially affected by notice of any instrument, fact, or thing unless it is within his own knowledge, or would have come to his knowledge if such inquiries and inspections had been made as ought reasonably to have been made by him." The question, therefore, whether the purchaser has been guilty of gross or culpable negligence, has been replaced by the question whether he has made reasonable inquiries, and in the new form, as was observed by Lord CRANWORTH with regard to the old, no definite rule to meet every case can be laid down. In the recent case of *Bailey v. Barnes* (42 W. R. 66) the Court of Appeal decided in favour of the purchaser under somewhat remarkable circumstances. Four houses were subject to a legal mortgage for £6,000, and also to a further charge in favour of an equitable incumbrancer. The mortgagees transferred their mortgage to BARNES on payment of £6,316 5s. 8d., the amount due to them. The next day BARNES conveyed the property to MIDGLEY for the same sum, the conveyance purporting to be under the power of sale contained in the mortgages. Subsequently MIDGLEY created a legal mortgage on the property for £6,000, and then sold the equity of redemption to LILLEY for £2,500. Upon the purchase by LILLEY the sale by BARNES to MIDGLEY was assumed to be valid, and no inquiry was made by reason of the fact that the purchase-money on that occasion was the exact amount paid on the transfer of the mortgage. But shortly afterwards the second incumbrancer brought an action to have the sale to MIDGLEY set aside, and in this he succeeded, thereby establishing his own right to redeem the property. Before, however, he had followed up his advantage, LILLEY paid off the mortgage created by MIDGLEY, and took a conveyance of the legal estate. He thus gained priority in respect of his purchase of the equity of redemption, unless at the time of such purchase he could be held to have constructive notice of the irregularity in the sale by BARNES to MIDGLEY. No doubt it is a remarkable fact that property should, on a *bond fide* sale by a mortgagee, fetch a price exactly equivalent to the amount due on the mortgage, but the Court of Appeal shrunk from appearing to be wise after the event, and though it was admitted that a suspicious purchaser would very likely have made inquiries, it was thought improper to punish LILLEY for omitting to make them. The expression "ought reasonably" in the Conveyancing Act, 1882, it was said, must mean "ought as a matter of prudence, having regard to what is usually done by prudent men of business in similar circumstances." This is a useful paraphrase, and it may be added that the prudent man of business abstains from making inquiries which would fix his client with notice unless he is clearly bound to make them.

A POINT of considerable international importance has arisen

under the Franco-Russian Treaty of 1874, in connection with the affairs of SAVITZKY, the Russo-Polish refugee. SAVITZKY died in France, leaving a number of private papers which the Russian authorities alleged to be of a compromising character. They were claimed by his grandmother, who was then resident in Paris. But the French court of first instance held that the Russian consul was entitled to them under the treaty of 1874, which makes the Russian consulate in Paris the guardian of the property of Russian subjects dying in France. This decision opens up an unpleasant vista for Russian and Polish refugees, and we are not surprised to learn that it is to be appealed to the *Cour de Cassation*, and that, if it is upheld, an interpellation on the subject will be made in the Chamber of Deputies.

THE DOCTRINE OF *DEARLE v. HALL*.

THE recently reported judgments delivered in the House of Lords in *Ward v. Duncombe* (42 W. R. 59), reported as *Re Wyatt, White v. Ellis* in the Court of Appeal (40 W. R. 177; 1892, 1 Ch. 188), contain a very interesting discussion of the doctrine that, upon an assignment of an equitable interest in personal estate, notice to the trustees is necessary in order to secure for the assignee priority over subsequent assignments. As pointed out by Lord HERSCHELL, C., and Lord MACNAGHTEN, the doctrine is quite modern, having been settled for the first time by the decision of Sir T. PLUMER, M.R., affirmed by Lord LYNCHURST, C., in *Dearle v. Hall* (3 Russ. 1, 48), and it appears to be derived from the analogy of apparent possession for the purpose of bankruptcy, with the singular result that it has become firmly established as a principle of equity, although the operation of the principle in bankruptcy is a matter entirely of statute law, and has been subjected to frequent alteration.

That the doctrine is really derived from the law of bankruptcy is clear from the prominence which was assigned in *Dearle v. Hall* to the decision in *Ryall v. Rowles* (1 Ves. 348, 2 Tudor's L. C. in Equity, 5th ed., p. 729). The immediate point decided in the latter case was that debts were chattels within the meaning of 21 Jac. 1, c. 19, s. 11, with the consequence that, if they remained in the possession, order, and disposition of the bankrupt at the time of the bankruptcy, they would pass to the assignees. Hence to prevent this result it was necessary that such measures should have been taken, analogous to the actual delivery of goods, as would take the debts out of the control of the bankrupt. Such control might be manifested in two ways. He might be left in a position to receive the debt from the debtor, and this must be avoided by giving notice to the debtor of the assignment; and he might be left in a position to make a fresh assignment to a subsequent assignee, and, in the case where there was a security for the debt, this was avoided by a delivery of the security. Hence it seems that, to take the debt out of the possession of the bankrupt, it was necessary that there should have been an assignment and delivery of the security (if any), and also that notice should have been given to the debtor of the assignment.

When it had been determined that *choses in action* fell within the statute, it was, of course, not necessary for the court to consider the grounds upon which the statute was founded. The intent of the statute, said LEX, C.J., "was to prevent the bankrupt's acquiring false credit; that, for the benefit of creditors in general, these goods shall be esteemed his, and distributable as his, so that they must come under the commission. Whether this was a wise provision or no in this statute is not for the determination of the court; for, while it continues a statute, it must be followed." And as to things in action, other than debts due or growing due to the bankrupt in the course of his trade or business, the law has been altered, the "order and disposition clause" of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 (section 44 (iii.)), providing that these shall not be deemed to be goods within the meaning of that section. But in *Dearle v. Hall* (*supra*) when the same principle was applied by analogy for the purpose of determining the relative priority of successive assignments of equitable interests in personalty a reason had to be given for it, and this was found in the loss caused to a subsequent assignee if the *cuiusque* trust was allowed to remain in apparent possession. In the absence of notice by the first

assignee to the trustees, the original *cestui que trust*, said PLUMER, M.R., "though he has in fact parted with his interest, appears to the world to be the complete equitable owner, and remains in the order, management, and disposition of the property as absolutely as ever; so that he has it in his power to obtain, by means of it, a false and delusive credit." On the other hand, by the notice, "the legal holders are converted into trustees for the new purchaser, and are charged with responsibility towards him; and the *cestui que trust* is deprived of the power of carrying the same security repeatedly into the market, and of inducing third persons to advance money upon it, under the erroneous belief that it continues to belong to him absolutely, free from incumbrances, and that the trustees are still trustees for him, and for no one else."

If the principle is based solely upon the ground that, by the absence of notice, the first assignee allows the *cestui que trust* to impose upon a subsequent assignee, it would seem to follow that, for the subsequent assignee to gain the benefit of the principle, he must actually have made inquiry, and have been misled as to the existence of a prior assignment. But in *Foster v. Cockerell* (3 Cl. & Fin. 456) the House of Lords decided that such inquiry was not necessary, and it was said that the first assignee, until he had given notice to the trustees, had not done everything that was necessary to complete his title.

In *Ward v. Duncombe* (*supra*) Lord MACNAGHTEN took exception to this form of expression. "In defence of the rule in *Dearle v. Hall*," he observed, "it has been said that notice is necessary in order to 'perfect' the title of the assignee—in order to 'complete' his title. Those expressions have frequently been used, but they are, I venture to think, little more than mere phrases. Notice does not render the title perfect. Notice was not even a step in the title until it was made so by the decision in *Foster v. Cockerell*. Apart from the rule in *Dearle v. Hall*, an assignee of an equitable interest from a person capable of disposing of it has a perfect equitable title, though the title is no doubt subject to the infirmity which attaches to all equitable titles. And that infirmity is not, and cannot be, wholly cured or removed by notice to the trustees." Lord MACNAGHTEN doubted, also, the accuracy of the statement that notice converts the trustees of the fund into trustees for the person giving the notice. "The trustees of the fund is trustee for the persons entitled to the fund; whether he knows their names or not. The notice no doubt places him under a direct responsibility to the person who gives the notice. If he disregards the notice he does so at his peril. But before notice given he is just as much a trustee for the persons rightfully entitled as he is after he receives the notice, though, of course, in the absence of notice, he would be safe in paying away the fund to those who appear by the instrument creating the trust, or by title properly deduced from them, to be the true owners." Moreover, as to the real ground of *Dearle v. Hall*—namely, the application by way of analogy of the "order and disposition" clause of the bankruptcy law—Lord MACNAGHTEN doubted whether it was justifiable. "The doctrine of reputed ownership is entirely the creature of statute, and applicable by statute in cases of bankruptcy only. I cannot help thinking that in extending the doctrine to cases of equitable assignment of personal property where there is no bankruptcy (which is practically what was done in *Foster v. Cockerell*) the court has gone perilously near legislating." And he pointed out how the law as to reputed ownership in bankruptcy had been altered from time to time.

But it is, of course, too late to question the soundness of the decision in *Dearle v. Hall*, and all that is now possible is to ascertain clearly the circumstances under which it applies. The principle, however it may be justified, is that the fund must be taken out of the control of the *cestui que trust*. This is done by giving notice to the trustees, and then, applying *Foster v. Cockerell*, we have the absolute rule that to secure priority for himself the assignee must give notice. If he does give notice he is safe. If he fails to give notice he has not observed the rule, and he is postponed to a subsequent assignee who has observed the rule, although the latter may not have inquired of the trustees as to incumbrances, and may not, therefore, have been misled by the first assignee's omission. "*Foster v. Cockerell*," said Lord MACNAGHTEN, "un-

questionably lays down that the rule known as the rule in *Dearle v. Hall* is independent of any consideration as to the conduct of competing assignees where the assignee second in date has no notice of the earlier assignment. Priority in such a case depends simply and solely on priority of notice."

But having thus arrived at an absolute rule as to the necessity of giving notice—and viewing the matter in this way, it seems not inappropriate to speak of the notice as "completing" the title—the effect of the notice has still to be determined with reference to the principle that it must take the fund out of the control of the *cestui que trust*. On this point the judgment of Lord HERSCHELL is very clear. It is only taken out of the control of the *cestui que trust* because, if inquiry is made of the trustees, it is possible to ascertain the fact of the prior assignment. The trustees, as was decided in *Low v. Bouverie* (40 W. R. 50; 1891, 3 Ch. 82) are not bound to make any reply at all. If they do not, the person inquiring proceeds at his own risk. But he has not exhausted the means of inquiry until he has inquired of all the trustees, and hence notice to any one of them is sufficient to satisfy the rule in *Dearle v. Hall*, and secure priority for the assignee giving the notice (*Smith v. Smith*, 2 Cr. & M. 231). If, however, the one trustee who has had notice is dead, there is no chance now of making effective inquiry, the fund is once more under the control of the *cestui que trust*, and a person subsequently taking an assignment and giving notice to the surviving trustees obtains priority (*Timson v. Ramsbottom*, 2 Keen, 35). This case was accepted by Lord HERSCHELL, but doubted by Lord MACNAGHTEN, who was inclined to give more weight to the rule that the first assignee must give notice, and less to the continuing effect of the notice on the apparent control of the *cestui que trust*. "It may be," he said, "that when an assignee or mortgagee has once discharged that duty [of giving notice] he has done all that the rule requires of him, . . . and that he is not, on a change of trustees, to be deprived of his pre-existing equitable title by the diligence or by the happy thought of a subsequent incumbrancer." This represents a divergence of opinion which will doubtless produce further decisions, but it was immaterial for the point at issue in *Ward v. Duncombe*. In that case notice of an assignment had been given to one of two trustees. During his life a second assignment was made, of which notice was given to both trustees. It was held that the subsequent death of the trustee who had had notice of the first assignment did not so place the fund again under the control of the *cestui que trust* in regard to that assignment as to give priority to the second assignment. This latter, indeed, was the only assignment of which the existing trustees had notice, but the rights of the parties had been already determined at the date of the second assignment. This view was taken by Lord HERSCHELL on the assumption that the effect of the notice was to be determined by the actual state of the *cestui que trust's* apparent possession at the time of the notice, and it is, of course, in accordance with Lord MACNAGHTEN's intimation, just referred to, as to the continuing effect of the notice in spite of changes in the apparent possession.

THE ORIGINATING SUMMONS NOT *INTER PARTES*.

WHAT is an originating summons not *inter partes*? This question is suggested by some remarks on the subject by the latest commentator on the Rules of November, 1893, in the article published in the current number of the *Law Quarterly Review*, to which we referred briefly last week. The reviewer is of opinion that the term is one ill-chosen and likely to cause confusion in the minds of practitioners. We confess our inability to share in these apprehensions. It may, however, be worth while to consider the matter carefully, and endeavour to arrive at the reasons which have induced the framers of the rules to add a new term to the legal glossary.

Some remarks of the reviewer might lead his readers to suppose that in his view originating summonses, at any rate such as are *inter partes*, owe their existence to the practice under the Judicature Acts, and are "creatures of the Rules of the Supreme Court." For ourselves we will not do him that injustice, for he must be aware that the "originating summons" as a method

of procedure can boast of a very respectable antiquity. That great measure of reform, the Chancery Procedure Act, 1852 (section 45), introduced the practice of obtaining by summons orders for administration. The practice thus established, of initiating proceedings in chambers, rendered it necessary to formulate a term which should distinguish an initiating summons from one issued in the course of proceedings already pending. Hence the terms "originating summons" and "ordinary summons." The term used in the orders of the court in force at that period was not "originating summons," but apparently "original summons" or "summons originating proceedings," but popularly the expression "originating summons" was invariably employed. The provisions of the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883, as to service (ord. 54, r. 4); appointment of new time for hearing (ord. 55, r. 22); appearance (ord. 55, r. 23) in the case of an originating summons were reproduced almost *verbatim* from the Consolidated Orders of the old Court of Chancery, and date back to 1852. Similarly the form of originating summons for administration given in the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1885 (App. L, No. 25), was founded on the exact lines of the form prescribed by the Consolidated Orders. As in the case of a bill of complaint under the old practice, or of a statement of claim under the new, such a summons was entitled: "Between A. B., plaintiff, and C. D., defendant." Of the same character are all summonses issued under the jurisdiction conferred by the Rules of the Supreme Court, ord. 55, rr. 3, 5a; they are similar in form, and subject to similar rules of procedure as to service, appearance, and the like, but of course with a largely extended area of jurisdiction.

In addition, however, to the class of summonses which we have been considering, various Acts of Parliament have from time to time been added to the Statute Book authorizing applications thereunder to be made in a summary way in chambers, as, e.g., the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874, and very many others. In all such cases the first step is a summons initiating proceedings, and, therefore, properly "originating." In form such summonses differ from those in the other class. There is no "record" properly so called which, as we have shown above, constitutes an essential part of the form of what we will term the summons *inter partes*. In passing it should be observed that the term "record," used in this connection, is merely a technical one, and must not be taken to mean that the cause-book record is not kept in respect of this class of summonses; or that they are treated in the Central Office differently from any other kind of originating summons. A summons of the class we are considering is entitled, not "Between A. B. and C. D.," but simply in the matter of the particular application, and in the matter of the Act conferring jurisdiction. The parties to such applications have never been termed "plaintiffs" and "defendants," but have always been described as "applicants" and "respondents." In some cases the forms are statutory, as, e.g., the forms of summons under the Settled Land Act, 1882. The distinction is one of importance, for it frequently happens that in these cases it is not necessary to serve the summons on any person, all necessary parties being applicants. In such case the summons is in precisely the same position as a petition to which there is no respondent. On the other hand there cannot, of course, be an originating proceeding by a plaintiff without a defendant on the other side of the record.

We have thought it necessary to dwell at what may seem undue length upon the distinction between the two classes of "originating summons," for herein is to be found the answer to the question with which we prefaced these remarks. The new procedure allowing service out of the jurisdiction of originating summonses rendered necessary a new form of summons, for the reasons stated *ante*, p. 93. It was a defect in the old rules that but one form of originating summons was given in the appendix (App. L, No. 25). The result of this in practice was that not infrequently summonses were issued wrongly entitled, and were required in chambers to be amended, at some considerable expense. Now we venture to think that the framers of the new rules have taken especial pains in the matter, so as to avoid any confusion. Ord. 13, r. 15, speaks of "an originating summons to which an appearance is required to be entered," the obvious reason for this being to meet the very common case of a summons (of the second class) to which no

appearance is required, owing to the fact of there being no respondent. As we point out elsewhere, it will probably be found convenient to prescribe a form of *ex parte* summons. Then, to cure the defect in the old rules to which we have alluded above, a specimen of each class of summons is given in the forms scheduled to the rules. Each summons being originating, what term was to be used to distinguish one from the other? We confess that we fail to see how a more convenient title could have been found for the class of summonses in which the parties are described (and properly described) as applicants and respondents, than that adopted by the Rule Committee, of a summons "not *inter partes*." It emphasises, as it seems to us, the broad distinction between such a summons and one entitled with a record as between plaintiffs and defendants. The term used sufficiently conveys the meaning it was intended to convey. Nobody insists on terms of art fulfilling the conditions of an exact grammatical construction, and to quibble about such questions of mere verbal accuracy can serve no useful or practical purpose. Well indeed would it be if the new rules offered no more vulnerable points than this to the shafts of hostile criticism. Such of our readers as have followed with any care the comments which have already appeared in these columns, must be aware that the rules do, in our opinion, contain provisions requiring serious consideration, and which the suitors of the court may ere long find to their cost to be fraught with grave results.

A little more care in considering the new rules would have saved the reviewer from a misconception. He falls foul of the instance of "originating summons not *inter partes*" given in the scheduled form because the case supposed is one under the Trustee Act, 1893, whilst ord. 55, r. 13a, requires such an application to be by "summons." Now a reference to the former rule for which this rule 13a is substituted shews that the applications there contemplated (*viz.*, for appointment of new trustees and for vesting orders) were to be "by summons." The present rule is much more extensive in its terms, owing to the fact that it consolidates all the applications under the Trustee Act, 1893, which can be made in chambers. This includes (*inter alia*) "an application for a vesting or other consequential order in any case where a judgment or order has been given or made for the sale, conveyance, or transfer of any land or stock." In the case alike of the old and new rule the word "summons" is used advisedly, for the very sufficient reason that, where the application is made in a pending matter, it will be by ordinary summons, whereas, where the summons is the initiating step, it must of course be "originating." In selecting this particular illustration of an originating summons "not *inter partes*" a wise discrimination has been exercised. Applications merely for the appointment of new trustees, and for consequential vesting orders, without any relief by way of administration, are probably the most frequent instances of recourse to the Trustee Act, and are, indeed, of almost daily occurrence in practice. In such case the summons is essentially one of the second class. The court is asked to decide no question, there is no issue as between the parties, all that is required is the exercise of a judicial discretion conferred by statute. Yet in these cases nothing is more common than to find that the summons is drafted as though it were made in a proceeding between "A. B., plaintiff," and "C. D., defendant." Why this should be so we are at a loss to understand, for no draftsman would so entitle a petition for precisely the same objects. In future it will be impossible for a practitioner, desiring to invoke the statutory power of the court for the appointment of new trustees without administration, to say that he has been misled in framing his application by the form provided by the Rules.

In the House of Commons on Monday Mr. Griffith-Boscawen asked the Home Secretary whether any successor had been appointed to Judge Homersham Cox, who resigned the county court judgeship of circuit 48, which includes Tunbridge Wells, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, Dartford, &c., early last October; and, if not, whether he could state the cause of the delay. Mr. Asquith said the Lord Chancellor has taken the opportunity, on vacancies occurring in the court referred to and other courts south of London, to rearrange the districts and to reduce the number of judges. Other arrangements, I understand, are also in progress for which these vacancies have afforded opportunity. The business of the courts has been fully provided for during the interval.

REVIEWS.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

A Treatise on the Law of Bankruptcy: Containing a Full Exposition of the Principles and Practice of the Law, including the Law under the Bankruptcy Acts, 1883 and 1890; the Bankruptcy (Discharge and Closure) Act, 1887; the Debtors Act, 1869; the Bills of Sale Acts, 1878 and 1882; Section 10 of the Judicature Act, 1875; also the Law relating to Private Arrangements with Creditors, and the Deeds of Arrangement Act, 1887; with an Appendix comprising the Statutes, Rules, Orders, and Forms, including Forms of Statutory Compositions and Schemes, &c. Seventh Edition. By GEORGE YOUNG ROBSON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. London: William Clowes & Sons (Limited).

A Legal Handbook for the Use of Hospital Authorities. By LEONARD SYER BRISTOWE, M.A. Oxon., Barrister-at-Law. Reeves & Turner.

The House of Lords: A Retrospect and a Forecast. By THOMAS ALFRED SPALDING, LL.B., Barrister-at-Law. T. Fisher Unwin.

CORRESPONDENCE.

APPLICATIONS UNDER ORDER 14 AGAINST MARRIED WOMEN.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—On an application under order 14 in an action against a married woman, the master has upheld a preliminary objection on the ground of the omission from the plaintiff's affidavit of any statement that the defendant was possessed of separate property, and has adjourned the summons for the affidavit to be amended. The writ was indorsed with a statement that the defendant was possessed of separate property at the date of the contract, and the affidavit stated that the defendant was justly and truly indebted to the plaintiff in the sum of £ for principal and interest due on a bill of exchange, and that the particulars of the claim appeared by the indorsement of the writ.

I have had a considerable number of such applications, and have never known the objection to be taken before, and I have spoken to other practitioners, whose experience is similar to mine, but on referring to the Annual Practice I find it stated, on page 325, that the allegation of separate property "must in every case be proved to the satisfaction of the judge or master before the application will be granted," with a reference to the cases of *Southern Counties Bank v. Farquhar* (34 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 182) and *Everett v. Paxton* (65 L. T. 383). The latter case did not arise under order 14, but the former case seems to cover the point exactly. It is, however, opposed to the more recent case of *May v. Chidley* (reported on page 82 of your issue of the 2nd December last). That case was an action on a dishonoured cheque. The writ, after amendment, contained a statement that notice of dishonour had been given, but there was no such statement in the affidavit, and objection was taken to this omission. The court overruled the objection, Mr. Justice Wills saying, "As the function of the affidavit is simply to verify the cause of action, it does not matter if it does not set out all the particulars of the statement of claim." I do not see any distinction between an allegation of notice of dishonour and an allegation that a married woman had separate property.

The case of *Southern Counties Bank v. Farquhar* is cited again in the Annual Practice, at page 378, with a note, "But see *Brereton v. Edwards* (4 Times Rep. 549)." In this case it was held that evidence of separate estate was not necessary on an application for judgment under order 14. The action, however, was for the price of goods supplied before marriage.

I think it desirable to call attention to the matter with a view to eliciting the correct practice in these cases, and in order that, if the statement in the Annual Practice is still to be considered correct, the delay and expense of an adjournment and amendment may for the future be avoided.

I may point out that the Married Women's Property Act, 1893, only applies to contracts made after the date when it was passed, the 5th of December last, so that for some time to come the courts will have to adjudicate upon actions under the previous law.

Jan. 10.

M.

NEW ORDERS, &c.

RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Rules 1 and 7 of the Rules of the Supreme Court, November, 1893 (Order XI., Service out of the Jurisdiction, and Order XVI., Rule

40), and so much of Rule 31 as annuls Order XI. of the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883, and also Forms No. 1, C., D., and E., of Appendix K., of the Rules of November, 1893, are hereby annulled: and whereas the immediate operation of this Rule is urgent, this Rule shall come into operation forthwith.

The 10th day of January, 1894.

(Signed)

HERSCHELL, C.
COLERIDGE, C.J.
EDWARD E. KAY, L.J.
F. H. JEUNE, P.
A. L. SMITH, L.J.
JOSEPH W. CHITTY, J.
ARTHUR CHARLES, J.

LAW SOCIETIES.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the board of directors of this association was held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, London, on Wednesday, the 10th inst.—Mr. John Henry Kays in the chair. The other directors present were Messrs. W. F. Blandy (Reading), W. Beriah Brook, H. Morten Cotton, Robert Cunliffe, Augustus Helder (Whitehaven), T. Brian Mellersh (Godalming), F. Rowley Parker, Sidney Smith, Frederic T. Woolbert, and J. T. Scott (secretary). A sum of £195 was distributed in grants of relief, five new members were admitted to the association, and other general business was transacted.

THE NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The twenty-third ordinary meeting of the society, being also the sixty-seventh anniversary of its institution as The Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Gateshead Law Society, was held on the 14th of December, 1893, Mr. GEORGE FENWICK BOYD, president, in the chair.

The notice convening the meeting was read.

The report of the Standing Committee, having been printed and circulated, was taken as read.

On the motion of the president, seconded by Mr. T. G. Gibson, the report was adopted and confirmed.

The auditor's report was presented, and, on the motion of Mr. T. G. Gibson, seconded by Mr. Stanton,

It was resolved:—"That the treasurer's accounts be passed and allowed."

The following gentlemen were declared to be duly elected as officers and members of the Standing Committee for the ensuing year, viz.:—

President, Mr. Frederick Walter Dendy; vice-president, Mr. Thomas Young Bramwell; treasurer, Mr. John Gibson Youll; standing committee, Mr. G. F. Boyd, B.A., Mr. William Daggett, Mr. R. R. Dees, Mr. A. H. Dickinson, Mr. F. Emley, Mr. T. G. Gibson, J.P., Mr. H. C. Harvey, M.A., Mr. W. T. Hindmarsh, F.L.S., Mr. F. Marshall, B.A., Mr. W. H. Ryott, Mr. W. J. S. Scott, and Mr. C. H. Stanton; honorary secretary, Mr. Robert Pybus, M.A.; honorary auditors, Mr. R. S. Holmes and Mr. George Parsons. A ballot was taken on proposals for the election of new members, and the following were declared duly elected, viz.:—Mr. Adolphus Anderson, Mr. Ralph Atkinson, Mr. William Charlton, jun., Mr. Edmund Hastings Neville, Mr. Thomas Alder Thorpe, Aldwick, and Mr. Robert Weddell, Berwick-upon-Tweed.

The following are extracts from the report of the committee:—

Members.—The present number of members is 114; of these 87 have offices in Newcastle or Gateshead.

Legal Procedure.—In the early part of the year this subject again occupied a good deal of the time of the committee, and the hon. secretary attended two meetings of the Associated Provincial Law Societies and one conference between the Council of the Incorporated Law Society and delegates from nearly all the provincial law societies in England. Within the last few days there have appeared in one or two legal periodicals certain draft rules, which, it is said, have been finally settled by the Council of Judges, though they have not yet been issued by the Rule Committee. Although these rules embody many of the recommendations of the Incorporated Law Society and of the associated societies, your committee regret to observe that, contrary to the opinion expressed, especially by Liverpool and Newcastle, discovery of documents is no longer to be a matter of right. We can only hope that in practice it will not be found very difficult to obtain an order; for although the right may have been occasionally abused, there can be no doubt that the exercise of it, or the knowledge of its existence, has far oftener stopped expensive litigation.

Land Transfer Bill.—A Bill, providing for the compulsory registration of titles, was introduced into the House of Lords by the Lord Chancellor, on the 10th of March, and was passed by that House and sent to the Commons on the 4th of August. It was read for a first time in the latter House on the 17th of August, and was then postponed to the autumn sitting. It has lately been withdrawn, but will probably reappear in some shape next session, for the leaders of both political parties seem to think that some capital is to be made out of legislation in the direction of the Bill. The council prepared lists of all the solicitors in every constituency in England and Wales, and sent them to the secretaries of the

nearest law societies. This society prepared a form of letter addressed to the members of Parliament for the constituencies of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Gateshead, Morpeth, Tynemouth, South Shields, Jarrow, Chester-le-Street, and the four divisions of the County of Northumberland, and obtained the signatures of ninety-five per cent. of the solicitors in those constituencies. The form of letter embodied the substance of this society's petition to the House of Lords, with some further objections which it was thought would have weight with the members of Parliament to whom they were sent. A copy was sent to each member of this society, and the committee venture to suggest that between now and the next session of Parliament every member of the society should endeavour to contribute to the formation of a sound public opinion on this question by bringing before at least one client the arguments therein contained. There can be little doubt that the opposition to the Bill has shewn the Government that it was not, as they thought, an unopposed measure, and that they had no chance of carrying it in this autumn session. The profession and the public owe a great deal to Mr. Benjamin G. Lake for the energy and ability with which he has led the opposition to the Bill. In discussing the matter with laymen it will probably be found that a prejudice in favour of the Bill arises chiefly from a notion that it will prevent fraud; whereas the kind of registration that would prevent fraud is very different from that which would simplify transfer. The one aims at disclosing by the register as much as possible, and the other as little as possible, leaving all trusts and equities to take care of themselves. It is not difficult to see that the latter system may make fraud easier than it is at present. At the same time, it would be unwise to say that it is quite impossible to devise a scheme of registration that would be beneficial. It is a matter of detail, and if a small body of conveyancers were chosen from both branches of the profession, it is possible that they could produce a scheme which would simplify and cheapen the transfer of land, at all events, for those who were fortunate enough not to have their titles affected by trusts; but the scheme must be very different from that which has just been withdrawn; it must be one tree from its roots upward, and not grafted upon an Act which has been proved to make the transfer of land in accordance with it more difficult and more costly. Those who doubt this being a true description of the Act of 1875 ought to read a paper read by Mr. Howlett, of Brighton, at the annual provincial meeting of the Incorporated Law Society held at Manchester in October last; but we are not obliged to go so far as Brighton for an illustration of this, for the committee have recently been favoured by a member of this society with the papers in a transaction in this neighbourhood which is so instructive as to be worth stating here. A man died intestate, possessed of a small freehold house, mortgaged to a building society and registered under the Land Transfer Act, 1875. His widow and his eldest son contracted to sell the house for £145, free from the mortgage. The following documents were necessary to complete the transaction:—1. Succession account of the son. 2. Statutory declaration in proof of his heirship, accompanied by certificates. 3. Application by the son to the Land Registry to be registered as heir-at-law and owner of the equitable estate in fee simple, subject to the widow's dower. 4. Memorial to the Land Registry by the son, nearly to the same effect as the application. In fact, 3 and 4 could have been easily amalgamated with a saving of expense. 5. Statutory declaration in further proof of the heirship, and identifying the applicant. 6. Certificate by an independent person as to the value of the property. 7. Statutory receipt on building society mortgage. 8. Statutory declaration by the solicitor of the society verifying the execution of the statutory receipt and identifying the society as the same as that entered in the register. 9. Certificate by the secretary of the authenticity of the signatures of the directors, and with copy resolution of the board. 10. Application by the son to the Land Registry to have the statutory receipt registered as a reconveyance. 11. Conveyance by the widow and the son to the purchaser in a short statutory form. 12. Statutory declaration verifying the execution of the conveyance by the son. 13. Statutory declaration verifying the execution of the conveyance by the widow. [Perhaps this could have been avoided if the same witness had been able to attest both executions.] Now, these, be it observed, were only the documents requiring to be prepared and perused on behalf of the vendor. The purchaser, on presenting the conveyance for registration, would have to prepare at least two more, namely:—14. An application by him to be registered as owner; and 15. A statutory declaration of identity. Four of these documents (namely, those numbered 1, 2, 7, and 11) would have been necessary had the title not been registered, but the other eleven are all caused by registration. The vendor's costs, irrespective of those relating to items 1, 2, and 7, would (but for a concession made by the solicitors) have amounted to £13 5s. 4d., including £1 2s. 6d. paid for registry fees; whereas, under the scale appended to the Solicitors' Remuneration Act, they would, at the most, have been £5. The purchaser's costs would be nearly as great; so that a sum of £15 or £16 was expended for a very doubtful advantage. The time taken to complete was fourteen weeks; but, on examining the bill of costs carefully, it appears that about six weeks were due to passing the succession accounts, proving the heirship, and to other delays for which registration was not responsible. The papers had, of course, to be sent to London, and agents had to be employed to transact the business at the Registry. Yet this is the Act which the Bill proposes to make compulsory! It is unfortunate that the opposition of the legal profession should be open to the suspicion of being interested. If the Act of 1875 be compulsorily applied in any form, it will be known soon, but too late, that the opposition was even more in the interest of the public. It is true that it is only proposed to apply the Act, if passed, to such district or districts as may be defined by Order in Council; but that only makes matters worse because it leads to the inference that even the advocates of the Bill have serious misgivings as to its success. We sincerely hope that

this district will not be the *corpus vile* upon which the experiment will be tried. Advocates of the Bill are very fond of pointing to foreign countries and British colonies as examples of the success of registration. Their statements are generally vague, and it is doubtful if they are based on trustworthy information, and if they take into account certain differences which can now never be removed. Your committee have ascertained that the cost of conveyancing in this country compares favourably with that in France and Switzerland where registration prevails, and they hope to extend their inquiries to other European countries and to the British colonies. They will be glad of any information on this point.

Incorporated Law Society, U.K.—From the foregoing remarks on the Land Transfer Bill it will have been seen that the chief society continues to attend to the interests of the profession with increasing zeal. It has spent a very large amount of time and money in opposing that Bill, having defrayed, not only the cost of its own opposition, but part of the expenses incurred by provincial societies. But for that our printer's bill would have been much larger this year.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETIES.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.—9th January.—Mr. A. Watson in the chair.—The subject for debate was: "That this House approves of the constitution and policy of the British South African Co., and especially of their action in connection with the recent disturbances in Matabeleland." Mr. Tudor Lay opened in the affirmative. Mr. E. A. Bell opened in the negative. The following members also spoke:—Messrs. H. Harcourt, Chatwin, Tebbutte, and Kinipple. Mr. Tudor Lay replied. The motion was carried by six votes. The subject for debate at the next meeting of the society, on the 16th of January, is: "That this society deplores that the Rules of the Supreme Court of Justice (November, 1893) will only cause unnecessary changes of procedure without remedying the evils referred to in the report of her Majesty's judges."

LEGAL NEWS.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. J. A. B. SHUTE, solicitor (of the firm of Shute & Swinson), 37, Bennetts-hill, Birmingham, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Shute was admitted in 1884.

Mr. JAMES CARTER BATE, solicitor, Chester, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Bate was admitted in November, 1886.

Mr. REGINALD HENRY BATE, solicitor, East Retford, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Bate was admitted in July, 1885.

Mr. WM. BOLLARD, solicitor, Nelson, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Bollard was admitted in March, 1887.

Mr. EDWARD CRUSEMANN, solicitor, 15, Philpot-lane, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Crusemann was admitted in April, 1887.

Mr. JOHN WM. COREN, solicitor, Gloucester, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Coren was admitted in July, 1887. Mr. Coren is honorary secretary to the Gloucester and Wiltshire Incorporated Law Society.

Mr. DIXON HENRY DAVIES, solicitor, Chesterfield, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Davies was admitted in August, 1887, after passing the final examination with honours.

Mr. ALEXANDER FROST DOUGLAS, B.A., LL.B. Camb., solicitor, Temple Chambers, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Douglas was admitted in July, 1886.

Mr. FRANK DWYER, solicitor, Dewsbury, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Dwyer was admitted in July, 1887.

Mr. ARTHUR HENRY EMANUEL, solicitor, Southampton, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Emanuel was admitted in July, 1887, after passing the final examination with honours.

Mr. HENRY ROBERT ELTON, solicitor, 55, Chancery-lane, W.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Elton was admitted in January, 1886.

Mr. RICHARD WALTER FORREST, solicitor, Gainsborough, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Forrest was admitted in December, 1884.

Mr. ARTHUR JAMES FIRBANK, solicitor, Chelmsford, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Firbank was admitted in December, 1886.

Mr. THOMAS WM. GINN, solicitor, Plymouth, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Ginn was admitted in August, 1887.

Mr. ARTHUR WILFRED BATE, solicitor, Huddersfield, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Bate was admitted in June, 1886.

Mr. FREDERICK CHARLES BIRD, solicitor, 13, Serjeants'-inn, Fleet-street, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Bird was admitted in June, 1885.

Mr. ALFRED EDWARD BROWN, solicitor, Leicester, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Brown was admitted in February, 1887.

Mr. BENJAMIN BEELEY BURROWS, solicitor, Leeds, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Burrows was admitted in February, 1886.

Mr. GEORGE BEECHALL, 85, Gracechurch-street, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Beechall was admitted in December, 1886.

Mr. LEONARD SCOTT ILIFF, solicitor, Sunderland, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Iliff was admitted in April, 1887.

Mr. HUBERT HANLEY LUSH, solicitor, Southsea, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Lush was admitted in July, 1886.

Mr. JOHN MOXON, solicitor, Newport, Mon., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Moxon was admitted in January, 1887. Mr. Moxon is Under-Sheriff of Monmouthshire.

Mr. MYER SAMUEL NATHAN, solicitor, 27, Walbrook, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Nathan was admitted in November, 1886, after passing the final examination with honours.

Mr. JOSEPH WILLIAM ASPREY, solicitor, 6, Furnival's-inn, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Asprey was admitted in July, 1886.

Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD ALLEN, solicitor, Leek, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Allen was admitted in October, 1887.

Mr. WILSON C. FORMAN, solicitor, of No. 62, Lincoln's-inn-fields, London, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths.

INFORMATION WANTED.

Will Wanted of the late EMILY HUSKISSON CROLE, Widow, late of Bristol, St. Leonards, and Royston; supposed to have been made subsequent to 4th March, 1885. Anyone knowing of same, please communicate with Park, Nelson & Co., 11, Essex-street, Strand, London, solicitors.

EDWARD CRASTON, deceased, late of 46, Castle-street, Shrewsbury, hatter, who died Christmas, 1889.—Wanted, the Original Will of the above. Apply to Clarke & Son, solicitors, Shrewsbury, solicitors for the executrix.

GENERAL.

The accounts of Lord Hennen's health are more satisfactory, and it is hoped he is gaining ground.

It is stated that Mr. Ernest Coleridge has been appointed private secretary to Lord Coleridge in succession to Mr. E. B. Lawford.

It is stated that Mr. Baron Pollock will be the only judge in attendance at the Guildhall for the present to try City of London causes, and that his lordship will commence the hearing of special jury cases there on Monday next.

The Times says that there is a very short list of House of Lords appeals at present set down, the total being six, of which two are English and four are Scotch appeals. No day has at present been fixed for beginning the hearing of these appeals.

At the Mansion House Police Court on Wednesday Charles Ernest Lindus, who described himself as a gentleman of no fixed abode, was charged before the Lord Mayor with shooting with a revolver, in an office on the ground floor of Church-court, Old Jewry, Mr. George Saunders Jacobs, a solicitor, and Eliza Lindus, his own wife. Horace Zabel, a clerk to Messrs. G. R. Browne & Co., solicitors, of Church-court, Old Jewry, said the prisoner, at 11.30 that morning, called there to see Mr. G. S. Jacobs. Witness shewed him into Mr. Jacobs's room, and one of them, either Mr. Jacobs or the prisoner, locked the door on the inside. Mr. Jacobs was in the room alone with the prisoner's wife. Three minutes afterwards he heard shrieks, followed by two reports of firearms. Then Mrs. Lindus rushed into the outer office. Witness and Mr. Jacobs's brother went into the room, and found the prisoner struggling with Mr. Jacobs. Witness went to Mr. Jacobs's assistance, and after a violent struggle, in which the prisoner bit his hand, he succeeded in getting the revolver from the prisoner. Two constables then arrived. Witness gave them the revolver, of which some chambers were still loaded. The prisoner's wife was a client of the firm. The prisoner had been there on many occasions before with his wife; of late however they had not come together to the office. The Lord Mayor remanded the prisoner for a week.

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice CHITTY.	Mr. Justice NORTH.
Monday, Jan.15	Mr. Carrington	Mr. Pugh	Mr. Ward
Tuesday16	Lavie	Beal	Pemberton
Wednesday17	Carrington	Pugh	Beal
Thursday18	Lavie	Beal	Pemberton
Friday19	Carrington	Pugh	Beal
Saturday20	Lavie	Beal	Pemberton
	Mr. Justice STIRLING.	Mr. Justice KEEWICH.	Mr. Justice ROMER.
Monday, Jan.15	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Godfrey	Mr. Rolit
Tuesday16	Cloves	Leach	Farmer
Wednesday17	Jackson	Godfrey	Rolit
Thursday18	Cloves	Leach	Farmer
Friday19	Jackson	Godfrey	Rolit
Saturday20	Cloves	Leach	Farmer

HILARY SITTINGS, 1894.

COURT OF APPEAL.

APPEAL COURT, I.

Final and interlocutory appeals from the Queen's Bench Division, the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division (Admiralty), and the Queen's Bench Division Sitting in Bankruptcy.

Thurs, Jan 11 (App motns ex pte—orgl motns—apps from ords made on interlocutory motns & new trial pa if required Bkey apps and new trial paper)
 Friday12
 Saturday13 No sitting
 Monday15 (App motns ex pte—orgl motns—apps from ords made on interlocutory motns and Q B final appeals if required)
 Tuesday16
 Wednesday17 Q B final apps
 Thursday18 Bkey apps and Q B final apps
 Friday19
 Saturday20 Q B final apps
 Monday22 (App motns ex pte—orgl motns—apps from ords made on interlocutory motns and Q B final appeals if required)
 Tuesday23
 Wednesday24 New trial paper
 Thursday25 Bkey apps and new trial paper
 Friday26
 Saturday27 New trial paper
 Monday29 (App motns ex pte—orgl motns—apps from ords made on interlocutory motns and Q B final appeals if required)
 Tuesday30
 Wednesday31 Q B final apps
 Thurs, Feb. 1 Bkey apps and Q B final apps
 Friday2
 Saturday3 Q B final apps
 Monday5 (App motns ex pte—orgl motns—apps from ords made on interlocutory motns & new trial pa if required)
 Tuesday6
 Wednesday 7 New trial paper
 Thursday8
 Friday9 Bkey apps and new trial paper
 Saturday10 New trial paper
 Monday12 (App motns ex pte—orgl motns—apps from ords made on interlocutory motns and Q B final appeals if required)
 Tuesday13
 Wednesday 14 Q B final apps
 Thursday15 Bkey apps and Q B final apps
 Friday16
 Saturday17 Q B final apps
 N.B.—Admiralty Appeals (with Assessors) will be taken on days to be appointed by the court.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Wednesday 31 (App motns ex pte—orgl motns—apps from ords made on interlocutory motns (sep list) and Chan final apps if required)
 Thursday, Feb. 1 County Palatine apps and Chan final apps
 Friday2
 Saturday3
 Monday5 Chan final apps
 Tuesday6
 Wednesday7 (App motns ex pte—orgl motns—apps from ords made on interlocutory motns (sep list) and Chan final apps if required)
 Thursday8
 Friday9
 Saturday10 Chan final apps
 Monday12
 Tuesday13 (App motns ex pte—orgl motns—apps from ords made on interlocutory motns (sep list) and Chan final apps if required)
 Wednesday14
 Thursday15
 Friday16 Chan final apps
 Saturday17

N.B.—Lunacy Petitions (if any) are taken in Appeal Court II. on every Monday at Eleven until further notice.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

Special Notice.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chan. Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

with the Judge's Clerk one clear day before the Further Consideration is ready to come into the paper.

CHANCERY COURT, II.

Mr. Justice NORTH.

Thurs, Jan 11...Mots and adj sums
 Friday12...Adj sums
 Saturday13...Sht caus, pets, and adj sum
 Monday16...Sitting in chambers
 Tuesday17
 Wednesday 17...Witness actions
 Thursday19
 Friday20
 Saturday22...Sitting in chambers
 Tuesday23
 Wednesday 24
 Thursday25...Witness actions
 Friday27
 Saturday28
 Monday30...Sitting in chambers
 Tuesday30
 Wed31...General paper
 Thurs, Feb. 1
 Friday2...Mots and adj sums
 Saturday3...Sht caus, pets, and adj sum
 Monday5...Sitting in chambers
 Tuesday6
 Wednesday 7...General paper
 Thursday8
 Friday9...Mots and adj sums
 Saturday10...Sht caus, pets, and adj sum
 Monday12...Sitting in chambers
 Tues13
 Wed14...General paper
 Thurs15
 Friday16...Mots and adj sums
 Saturday17...Sht caus, pets, & adj sums
 Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard. Two copies of minutes of the proposed judgment or order must be left in court with the judge's clerk the day before the cause is to be put in the paper.

LORD CHANCELLOR'S COURT.

Mr. Justice STIRLING.

Thurs, Jan 11...Mots, adj sums, and gen pa
 Friday12...Adj sums and gen pa
 Saturday13...Sht caus, pets, adj sums, and gen pa
 Monday15...Sitting in chambers
 Tuesday16
 Wednesday 17...General paper
 Thursday18
 Friday19...Mots, adj sums, and gen pa
 Saturday20...Sht caus, pets, adj sums, and gen pa
 Monday22...Sitting in chambers
 Tuesday23
 Wednesday 24...General paper
 Thurs25
 Friday26...Mots, adj sums, and gen pa
 Saturday27...Sht caus, pets, adj sums, and gen pa
 Monday29...Sitting in chambers
 Tuesday30
 Wednesday 31
 Thurs, Feb. 1...Witness actions
 Friday2
 Saturday3
 Monday5...Sitting in chambers
 Tuesday6
 Wed7
 Thursday8...Witness actions
 Friday9
 Saturday10
 Monday12...Sitting in chambers
 Tuesday13
 Wed14...General paper
 Thursday15...Mots for Kekewich, J, and gen pa
 Friday16...Mots, adj sums, & gen pa
 Saturday17...Sht caus, pets, adj sums, and gen pa, including unopposed pets for Kekewich, J

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers, including minutes of the proposed judgment or order, must be left with the judge's clerk one clear day before the cause is to be put into the paper.
 If the state of business admits, the witness list may be taken on days (of which due notice will be given) in addition to those above appointed.

COURT OF APPEAL.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1894.

APPEAL COURT I.—NOTICES.

Queen's Bench Interlocutory Appeals will be taken in Court I. on Thursday, Jan 11, and afterwards on every Monday in Hilary Sittings. Bankruptcy Appeals will probably be taken on Friday. There will be no sitting in Court I. on Saturday, Jan 13.

CHANCERY COURT, IV.

Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.

Subject to any special announcement arising out of the arrangement for the disposal of Witness Actions, the following will be the Order of Business according to the days of the week:—

Monday—Sitting in Chambers.
 Tuesday, Wednesday (except the last day of the sittings), and Thursday—General Paper.

Friday—Motions and Non-Witness Actions or Adjourned Summonses.

N.B.—Thursday, January 11, and Wednesday, March 21, will also be Motion days.

Saturday—Short Causes, Petitions, and Non-Witness Actions or Adjourned Summonses.

Witness Actions only will be taken for the fortnight commencing Tuesday, February 13, and ending Saturday, February 24, Monday, February 19, excepted.

Witness Actions will also be taken on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, as soon as the non-witness business has been disposed of, and probably on Tuesday, January 23.

Liverpool and Manchester Business will be taken as follows:—

Motions on days appointed for Motions.

Short Causes, Petitions, and Adjourned Summonses on Saturdays.

Summonses in Chambers on Friday Afternoon, Liverpool and Manchester Summonses being taken on alternate Fridays, commencing with Liverpool Summonses on Friday, January 19th.

CHANCERY COURT, III.

Mr. Justice ROMER.

Actions transferred for Trial or Hearing only will be taken in the order in the Cause List on every day of the Sittings, from January 11 to March 21, both inclusive.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

With reference to the CHANCERY WITNESS LISTS.

During the Hilary Sittings the Judges will sit for the disposal of their own Witness Lists as follows:—

Mr. Justice North will begin on Tuesday, January 16, and sit continuously (Monday, January 22, excepted), until Saturday, January 27.

Mr. Justice Stirling will begin on Tuesday, January 30, and sit continuously (Monday, February 5, excepted) until Saturday, February 10.

Mr. Justice Kekewich will begin on Tuesday, February 13, and sit continuously (Monday, February 19, excepted) until Saturday, February 24.

Mr. Justice Chitty will take his witness list for the ensuing fortnight, beginning on Tuesday, February 27, and will sit continuously (Monday, March 5, excepted) until Saturday, March 10.

If the state of the business permits, the witness list may be taken on days in addition to those above appointed, and due notice will be given.

During the fortnight when a judge is engaged as above on his witness list motions in causes or matters assigned to him (including ex parte motions, but not including motions relating to the postponement of the trial or hearing of any case or matter in his lordship's list), and also unopposed petitions assigned to him will be heard by one of his colleagues as follows:—

Those assigned to Mr. Justice North will be heard by Mr. Justice Chitty.

Those assigned to Mr. Justice Stirling will be heard by Mr. Justice Kekewich.

Those assigned to Mr. Justice Kekewich will be heard by Mr. Justice Stirling.

Those assigned to Mr. Justice Chitty will be heard by Mr. Justice North.

Queen's Bench Final Appeals and New Trial Motions will be taken in Court I. in alternate weeks during the Sittings. New Trial Motions will probably be taken in Court I. on Monday, Jan 15, and following days in that week. Final Appeals in the week after. N.B.—As soon as the course of business is definitely settled, notice will be given in the Daily Cause List.

On Mondays and Fridays Final Appeals or New Trial Motions will be taken if there are not enough Interlocutory or Bankruptcy Appeals for a day's Paper.

Admiralty Appeals (with Assessors) will be taken in Court I. on days specially appointed by the Court, notice of which will appear in the Daily Cause List.

APPEAL COURT II.—NOTICES.

N.B.—Interlocutory appeals from the Chancery and Probate and Divorce Divisions will be taken in Court II. on Thursday, Jan 11, and afterwards on every Wednesday in Hilary Sittings. As there are not at present any Chancery Interlocutory Appeals ready for the first day, Chancery final appeals will very likely be taken on that day.

N.B.—Subject to Chancery interlocutory appeals on Wednesdays, Chancery final appeals will be taken every day in Court II. until further notice.

N.B.—When the interlocutory appeals are not enough for a day's paper, Chancery final appeals will be added on interlocutory days.

Appeals from the Lancaster and Durham Palatine Courts (if any) will be taken in Court II. on Thursday, Jan 18, Thursday, Feb 1, and on Thursday, March 1.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—In consequence of the limited state of the Chancery Appeal list, the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the judges, of which due notice will appear in the daily cause list.

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

For Judgment.

Brett v The Monarch Investment Building Soc (Q B Crown Side) app of debts from Justices Charles and Wright, dated Oct 26, reversing judgment in Mayor's Court for debts (c a v Nov 2—present Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Lopes and Kay)

The Queen, on prosecution of St George's Union Assessment Committee v The Justices for the County of London (Q B Crown Side) app of London County Council from order of Justices Charles and Vaughan Williams, dated June 20, for prohibition of app against St George's Valuation List (app heard Aug 1, by Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Bowen and Kay Judgment given Aug 11—argued on question of Costs in Divisional Court on Nov 20, before Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Lopes and Kay, when judgment reserved)

Synge v Synge app of plaintiff from judgment of Mr. Justice Mathew, dated April 22, on further consideration in London after trial without a jury at Bristol (c a v Nov 30—present Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Lopes and Kay)

Kingston-upon-Hull Dock Co v Guardians of Scolcoates Union (Q B Crown Side) app of Guardians from judgment of Justices Mathew and Collins, dated June 19, on special case stated by arbitrator remitting for reconsideration as to rateable value of dock property in Scolcoates Union (c a v Dec 18—present Lord Halsbury and Lords Justices Lopes and Kay)

Seed v Bradley app of debt from judgment of Mr. Justice Day, dated Nov 3, at trial of interpleader issue without a jury at Manchester (c a v Dec 19—present Lords Justices Lopes and Kay)

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION.

(Final List.)

1893.

London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Co v South-Eastern Railway Co app of the South-Eastern Railway Co from order of Mr. Justice Kekewich, on fur con, dated July 30, 1891 (S O generally by order of Dec 8, 1891—restored after appeal to House of Lords from order on application to vary Official Referee's report—not before Jan 15, 1894)

In re Copiapo Mining Co. Id Expte T Mashiter app of T Mashiter from judgment of Mr. Justice North, dated Aug 1, refusing rectification of register by restoring name of appellant Aug 19

Thorne v Read (2) app of plaintiff from judgment of Mr. Justice Romer, dated June 2, 1893, dismissing action for account and payment under mortgage and other securities Dec 6

Cann v Thorne (2) app of defendant from judgment of Mr. Justice Romer, dated April 25, 1893, dismissing counter-claim and directing specific performance of agreement for sale, dated June 2, 1892 Dec 7

In re an application for registration of Trade-Mark No 171,457 by Farbenfabriken Vormals Friedr. Bayer & Co, of Elberfeld, Germany, and Patents, &c, Acts, 1883-8 app of above-named company from judgment of Mr. Justice North, dated Nov 24, dismissing application for registration of trade-mark on reference to High Court by Board of Trade Dec 15

In re Contract dated Oct 7, 1892, for sale of real estate at Newport, made between Thomas Ponsford and The Newport District School Board and V and P Act, 1874 appl of Thomas Ponsford from judgment of Mr. Justice North, dated Nov 8, declaring requisition as to title not sufficiently answered Dec 15

Hind (widow) v Montagu appl of debt from judgment of Mr. Justice Kekewich, dated Nov 28, declaring plaintiff entitled in fee simple to strip of land in County of York in claim mentioned Dec 16

Rouse v Bradford Banking Co, Id (2) claim and counter-claim app of defendants from judgment of Mr. Justice Kekewich, dated Dec 7, 1893, dismissing counter-claim for charge on bank shares Dec 18

Companies winding up In re the Lyric Club, Id, and Co's Acts app of Sir Julian Goldamid (a director) from judgment of Mr. Justice Wright

(sitting as an additional judge) dated Dec 8, refusing appln to expunge proofs Dec 20

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND ADMIRALTY DIVISIONS.

For Hearing.

(Final List.)

1893.

- Stoddart v The Imperial Union Accident Assee Co ld** app of Defts from judgt of Mr Justice Lawrance, dated July 5, at trial with a special jury at Cumberland (new trial not asked for) July 20
- Chancery Action Chamberlain v Marriott** app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Day (for Mr Justice Kekewich), dated March 10, 1893 Same Action application of plt for leave to adduce *vis a vis* evidence on hearing of app (postponed on August 9 till hearing of appl) Aug 2
- Jenkinson v Yeates** app of plt from judgt dated 5 July, at trial before Mr. Justice Lawrance and a special jury at Carlisle—verdict for plt—judgt for deft Aug 28
- Chancery action Smith v Raines** app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy (for Mr Justice Kekewich), dated July 20, at trial without a jury at Manchester Oct 12
- Ship Gerona** (agreement as to carriage of goods) W N White & Co ld v Owners of the Gerona app of plts from judgt of the President and Mr. Justice Gorell Barnes, dated July 4, on app from City of London Court (without assessors) Oct 24
- Haddow v Marton** (Ellen Trout, clmt—Q B Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Charles & Wright for claimants, dated Oct 26, reversing judgt for plt in county court Oct 28
- Aitken, Lilburn, & Co v Ernsthausen & Co** app of plts from judgt of Baron Pollock, dated Oct 26, at trial without a jury at Guildhall (special jury discharged) Oct 30
- Allinson v The General Council of Medical Education and Registration** app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Collins, dated June 26, at trial without a jury in Middlesex November 8
- Wadey v Goldsworth** app of plt from judgt of Justices Wills and Grantham, dated Oct 30, affirming judgt of Official Referee at trial at Liverpool November 9
- The Weardale Iron & Coal Co v O W Hodson, deft—A E Hodson, clmt (Q B Crown Side)** app of clmt from judgt of Justices Charles and Wright, dated Nov 2, affirming judgt of County Court for plt company (Execution Creditors) November 9
- The Transvaal Oil Engine Co ld v Moll** app of plts from judgt of Baron Pollock, dated Oct 28, at trial without a jury in Middlesex Nov 13
- Baring Bros & Co ld v The Marine Insee Co ld** app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Cave, dated Nov 8, at trial without a jury in Middlesex Nov 13
- Stroud v The Wandsworth District Board of Works (Q B Crown Side)** app of F Stroud from judgt of Justices Charles and Wright, dated Nov 10, on case stated affirming decision of Magistrate on claim for apportionment of works done to road Nov 17
- Hobman v The Greenwich District Board of Works (Q B Crown Side)** app of A C W Hobman from judgt of Justices Charles and Wright, dated Oct 30, on case stated affirming decision of Magistrate on claim for apportionment of expenses for paving new street Nov 20
- Thompson v The Cowles Syndicate Co, ld** app of plt from judgt of Baron Pollock, dated Nov 14, at trial without a jury in Middlesex Nov 21
- Kelly v Beaumont** app of dft in person from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Nov 14, at trial with a special jury in Middlesex, and asking for rehearing before a Divisional Court Nov 22
- De Veyry v The Giffard Inventions Trust, ld, & ora** app of exors, &c of dft W. Fox, dec, from judgt of Mr Justice Wills, dated Nov 13, at trial without a jury in Middlesex Nov 25
- Buckley & anr v Hargreaves** app of plts from judgt of Baron Pollock, dated Nov 8, at trial without a jury in Middlesex Nov 27
- Hoff v Bailey & anor** (trading, &c) app of plt from judgt, dated Nov 13, for dft, after verdict for plt at trial before Mr Justice Cave with a special jury in Middlesex Nov 28
- Dunhill v Norton** app of deft from judgt of Justices Wills and Grantham dated Oct 23, refusing to set aside finding and judgt of Official Referee at trial of action Dec 1
- Gough v Wood** app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Wright, dated Nov 9, at trial without a jury in Middlesex Dec 2
- Doros Bros v W N White & Co ld** app of dfts from judgment of Mr Justice Grantham, dated Nov 27, at trial without a jury at Liverpool Dec 6
- Christie** (on behalf of self and owners of Steamship Alcester) v E A Ditchfield & Co app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Collins, dated Nov 27, at trial without a jury at Cardiff Dec 7
- Sugg & Co ld v Hill & ora** app of dfts (except Ernest Hart) from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Nov 30, at trial without a jury in Middlesex Dec 11
- Edwards v Marcus & anr** (Townend and Chadwick & Sons, clmts) app of J F Townend from judgt of Justices Wright and Lawrance, dated Nov 21, on special case deciding that goods seized by sheriff not claimants' property Dec 12
- Registration Appeal Kemp v Wanklyn** (Q B Crown Side) app of Robert Kemp from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Lawrance and Collins, dated Dec 5, affirming decision of Revising Barrister Dec 15
- Burgees v Morton** app of deft from judgt of Justices Wills and Wright, dated Dec 2nd, for plt in the action with costs, as asked for by special case stated therein Dec 18
- Ship Rookwood Chas Hill & Sons v W J Lockett** app of dfts from judgt of the President, dated Dec 6, 1893 (without assessors) Dec 18

(To be continued.)

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1894.

Notices relating to the Chancery Cause List.

Motions, Petitions, and Short Causes will be taken on the usual days stated in the Hilary sittings paper, with the following exceptions—viz.:

Mr. Justice Chitty.—In consequence of Mr. Justice Chitty sitting for the disposal of his lordship's own witness list from Tuesday, February 27, until Saturday, March 10 (inclusive), his lordship's motions and unopposed petitions during that time will be taken by Mr. Justice North—that is to say, motions on Thursday, March 1, and Thursday, March 8; unopposed petitions on Saturday, March 3, and Saturday, March 10.

Mr. Justice North.—In consequence of Mr. Justice North sitting for the disposal of his lordship's own witness list from Tuesday, January 16, until Saturday, January 27 (inclusive), his lordship's motions and unopposed petitions during that time will be taken by Mr. Justice Chitty—that is to say, motions on Thursday, January 18, and Thursday, January 25; unopposed petitions on Saturday, January 20, and Saturday, January 27. N.B.—His lordship has selected 20 witness actions from the early part of his own witness list for trial during the fortnight commencing Tuesday, January 16, which will be published in the first daily cause list.

Mr. Justice Stirling.—In consequence of Mr. Justice Stirling sitting for the disposal of his lordship's own witness list from Tuesday, January 30, until Saturday, February 10 (inclusive), his lordship's motions and unopposed petitions during that time will be taken by Mr. Justice Kekewich—that is to say, motions on Thursday, February 1, and Thursday, February 8; unopposed petitions on Saturday, February 3, and Saturday, February 10.

Mr. Justice Kekewich.—In consequence of Mr. Justice Kekewich sitting for the disposal of his lordship's own witness list from Tuesday, February 13, until Saturday, February 24 (inclusive), his lordship's motions and unopposed petitions during that time will be taken by Mr. Justice Stirling—that is to say, motions on Thursday, February 15, and Thursday, February 22; unopposed petitions on Saturday, February 17, and Saturday, February 24.

Mr. Justice Kekewich.—Subject to the special arrangement for the disposal of witness actions, the order of business in Mr. Justice Kekewich's court will be as detailed on the sittings paper. His lordship will also take witness actions on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, as soon as the non-witness business has been disposed of, and probably on Tuesday, January 23.

Mr. Justice Romer will take witness actions every day in the order as they stand in his lordship's cause book.

Mr. Justice Wright (sitting as an additional judge of the Chancery Division) will dispose of any remaining transferred Chancery actions at present standing over generally on application to his lordship in court to fix a day for trial.

Summonses before the judge in chambers.—Justices Chitty, North, Stirling, and Kekewich will sit in court the whole day on every Monday during the sittings to hear chamber summonses.

Summonses adjourned into court will be taken (subject to the witness list) as follows:—Mr. Justice Chitty, with non-witness actions, except procedure summonses, which (if any) are taken every Saturday; Mr. Justice Stirling, with non-witness actions; Mr. Justice North on Fridays and Saturdays; Mr. Justice Kekewich on Fridays and Saturdays, and also on other days as the judges may direct.

SPECIAL NOTICE WITH REFERENCE TO THE CHANCERY WITNESS LISTS

During the Hilary Sittings the judges will sit for the disposal of their own witness lists as follows:—

Mr. Justice North will begin on Tuesday, January 16, and sit continuously (Monday, January 22, excepted), until Saturday, the 27th January.

Mr. Justice Stirling will begin on Tuesday, 30th January, and sit continuously (Monday, the 5th February, excepted) until Saturday, the 10th February.

Mr. Justice Kekewich will begin on Tuesday, the 13th February, and sit continuously (Monday, the 19th February, excepted) until Saturday, the 24th February.

Mr. Justice Chitty will take his witness list for the ensuing fortnight, beginning on Tuesday, the 27th February, and will sit continuously (Monday, the 5th March, excepted), until Saturday, the 10th March.

During the fortnight when a judge is engaged on his witness list, motions in causes or matters assigned to him (including *ex parte* motions, but not including motions relating to the postponement of the trial or hearing of any cause or matter in his lordship's list) and also unopposed petitions assigned to him, will be heard by one of his colleagues as follows:—

Those assigned to Mr. Justice North will be heard by Mr. Justice Chitty.

Those assigned to Mr. Justice Stirling will be heard by Mr. Justice Kekewich.

Those assigned by Mr. Justice Kekewich will be heard by Mr. Justice Stirling.

Those assigned to Mr. Justice Chitty will be heard by Mr. Justice North.

Causes for Trial or Hearing.

(Set down to Tuesday, January 2, inclusive.)

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Before Mr. Justice CHITTY. | for exam and cross exam of dfts on affidavits by order) |
| In re W Sapote, dec, Morrison v | In re Rebbeck, dec Bennett v |
| Sapote expte plfts adj summs | Rebbeck act pt heard restored |
| part heard (placed in witness list | by order |

- Evans v Melville (now Lord Leven) act
 The Solicitors' Government Stocks Investment Trusts ld v Rushworth act (transf'd from Q B Division)
 Carter's Medicine Co v Carr act
 Ackroyd v Barker motion by dft to compel plt to execute lease under judgt (set down in Witness List by order)
 Suggden, Keighley & Co ld v Dixon act (s o until pleadings closed)
 Chepstow Union Rural Sanitary Authority v Lysaght act (s o until pleadings closed)
 Cary v Watt act
 In re Robertson Tyre Syndicate ld & Co Acta motion (set down in Witness list by order)
 Brown Bayley's Steel Works ld v Willford act (s o until pleadings closed)
 The Imperial Ottoman Bank v The Trustees and Executors, &c, Corporation, ld act
 Harris v Gurrin act
 Dennis v Upperton Hygienic Steam Laundry Co ld act
 Lickman v Oakley act
 In re Edwards, dec Edwards v Mead act
 Rooney v Rathbone act
 Ullmann v Ullmann act
 Hobbs v Champneys (2) act
 Lane v Ellis act
 Mellish v Fraser & Chalmers, ld act (S O until pleadings closed)
 Banks v Banks act (set down by order)
 Dawson v Scharrer act
 Murray (on behalf, &c) v The European Commercial and Industrial Co, ld Ex parte London and Scottish Banking and Discount Corporation, ld motion to restrain remaining in possession of premises (Set down by order for cross-examination on affidavits)
 Adams v Searle act and m f j
 In re Richard Lloyd, dec Lloyd v Richards act
- Causes for Trial (without witnesses).
 Baring Bros. & Co, ld v The New English Bank of the River Plate act, with wits, pt hd (transferred by order to non-wits list)
 In re The Newcastle, Northumberland, and Durham Permanent Benefit Building Society & Co's Acta adj sums by official liquidator, heard in court on Aug 2, 1892 restored by order for determination of questions stated in statement of facts as to priorities and proportion of losses
 In re W Silversides' Estate Em-merson v Silversides (order 55) Expte legatee adj sums
 In re Freebody, dec Freebody v Lealie adj sums (restored)
 In re Breese, dec Breese v Jones adj sums (restored)
 Loder v Loder (expte Loder's Trustees) adj sums for directions
 In re R H Howard's Will Trusts (10, 11 Vict c 96; 12, 13 Vict c 74) Expt Admor adj sums
 In re Tetley and Booth's Contract and V & P Act, 1874 (expte V Booth) title and release of covenants adj sums
 In re Hayes & Pilbrow and Hereditas at Hackney Expte London School Board adjd sums of Hayes & aur and School Board Nicholson v Bealey act & m f j
 In re G R Grant a bill Expte W J B Chetwynd (s o of costs) adjd sums
 In re B Wells, dec Lacey v Wells expte trustees and executors adjd sums
 In re S Long's Settlement Harrington v Harrington directions to receiver adjd sums
 In re S Long's Settlement In re Long's Settlement Fennell v Harrington expte c q t under settlement adjd sums
 Hopkinson v Powis and 5 other actions apportionment of rent expte Fennell and others adjd sums
 In re Alfred Watson, dec, Brex v Brex m f j (abated)
 In re W A Boulnois' Estate Johnson v Boulnois expte Exor of Will for determination of questions adj sums
 In re R A Lloyd, dec, Lloyd v Chambers expte Legatees adj sums
 In re Trusts of Isaac Quincey's Mortgage expte Fountain's Exor and Extrix and c q t adj sums
 In re George Whiston's Settled Estate Lovatt v Williams expte Whiston's Trustees and Exors adj sums
 In re Contract dated 1st Oct, 1892, between the Sykes Brewery Co and the Trent Brewery Co (Assignees of Hartley) and V and P Act, 1874 ex parte Trent Co adjd sums
 In re Contract dated 10th May, 1893, between Annie Harris and Henry J Rawlings and V and P Act, 1874 ex pte Trustees of S J Harris, dec, as to requisitions adjd sums
 Schauer v Field objections to taxation adjd sums
 In re Kidgrove Steel & Iron Co ld expte Norwich Union, &c, Co (mortgagees in possession — set off) adj sums
 In re Contract dated March 18, 1892, between the Mayor, &c of London and H T Tubbs and V & P Act, 1874, expte Mayor, &c, of London adj sums
 In re J L Garden, dec, Garden v The Princess Murat adj sums
 In re R P Carew, dec, Glanville v Robartes expte pliffs for determination of questions in administration adj sums
 Cunack v Edwards act
 In re Benjn Brown's Estate, Eves v Hasbord adj sums by pliff for declaration under order 55
 In re R O Jenkins's Settlement Trusts dated Aug 7, 1897, and Settlement Trusts dated Aug 25 1843 Jenkins v Lumley (Settltmt Trusts) expte Settlement Trustees adj sums
 In re Wm Clements, dec, Clements v Pearall expte Exors and Trustees for determination of questions in administration adj sums
 In re Thos Hunt, dec, Clements v Bonner expte Residy Legatee for determination of questions in administration adj sums
 In re Fletcher & Pye's Trust Deed In re Sarah Fletcher, dec Pattison v Pye expte Pltff and others for authority to raise money adjd sums
 In re Sarah Fletcher, dec In re Robt Fletcher, dec In re Fletcher & Pye's Deed Trust Pattison v Pattison expte Legatees adj sums (advanced by order)
 Att Gen v Park act
 Att Gen v Christ's Hospital act
 In re H. S. Holford, dec, Holford v Holford adm adj sums
 In re Rev. Wm. Phillips, dec, Carter v Phillips expte Legatee adj sums
 In re J. L. Taylor, dec, Taylor v Wade (share of partnership profits) adj sums by Exors
- In re Hett, Naylor & Co ld and the Chartered Bank of India, Australia and China (set off) ex pte Official Liquidator adj sums
 In re Jno Astle's Trusts Popham v Wright (execution of Trusts) adj sums
 In re T B Sutcliffe, dec Hanson v Wilson expte Trustees adj sums
 In re Hall, dec Hall v Hall m f j
 In re The Duke of Marlborough's pension expte The Duke of Marlborough (succession duty) adj sums
 In re Edward Thompson's Estate Griffith v Thompson expte Griffith & aur adj sums
 Walker v Lambeth Waterworks Co special case
 Turner v Tinkler m f j
 In re J W Beesty's Trusts of proceeds of sale of mortgaged Hereditaments at Cookham and 10, 11 Vict c 96 adj smns by mortgagees for taxation and payment out
 In re A P Cahill, dec Logan v Cahill ex pte Executors and Trustees of will adj smns
 In re H S Pinhorne, dec Moreton v Hughes ex pte Executors and Trustees adj smns
 In re F W C Neville's Settlement Trusts Hall v Neville ex pte Settlement Trustees adj smns
 In re F W Beckingham's Trust Wells v Beckingham ex pte one of Settlement Trustees (Order 55) adj smns
 In re Richard N Haworth, a solr and Solors' Act, 1868 Expte Buckwell (Taxation) adj sums
 In re Hodson's Settlement Trusts In re Thomas Knight the elder, dec Williams v Knight Expte trustees of Knight's will adj sums
 In re S Osborne, dec Osborne v Child Expte surviving trustee of will adj sums
 In re Aiken's Trusts Expte Florence Soames and ors tenants for life adj sums
 James v Burn m f j (short)
 Peach v Jeffs m f j (short)
 In re George Head, dec Head v Head Tester's claim adj sums (To be in paper on Tuesday, 23 January, by order)
 In re W T Foster's Estate Foster v Borthwick expt executrix and legatee adj sums
- Further Considerations.
 In re Powell, dec Allen v Fowler fur con (s.o. till after certificate)
 Guthrie v Davidson fur con (restored by order)
 In re Phillips, dec Biggs v Hobden fur con
 In re Birkin, dec Crafter v Birkin fur con adjd from Chambers (short)
 In re Farmer, dec Bassett v Farmer fur con
 In re Wooton, dec Wooton v Donnithorne fur con reserved by Chamber order
 In re Dyson, dec Dyson v Dyson fur con (Set down by order notwithstanding no C.C. certificate subsequent to last reservation)
- Before Mr. Justice North.
 Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
 Mara v Browne action restored (To stand out of the 20 selected actions)
 Keane v Billings act (set down by dft) (order for security)
 Hassell v Watts act
- Gould v Ross act
 Moggy v Knott act
 Westminster Trust ld v Troutbeck act
 Tuff v Tuff act
 Re Stephens, Stephens v Lacy, Lacy v Stephens act and 3rd party notice of dft Marshall
 Gingold v Borthwick, Wark, & Co act
 Frisell v Little act
 Halfey v Boyd act
 Re Errington, Kemp v Errington act (To stand out of the 20 selected actions)
 Re Wild, Richardson v Wild act
 Mayfair Propy Co ld v Johnston act
 Mann v Van Tromp act
 Graham v Eadie act
 Willans v Buckley act
 Cwmnygo Cambrian, &c, Bldg Soc v Williams act
 Goodall v Megrah act & m f j
 In re Trenholm, dec, Weighill v Coulson act Easter Sittings
 Walters v Gray act
 Re Holloway Holloway v Holloway act
 Goldsmiths' Co v Tubbs act
 Knight v Bethune act
 Aspinall v Martin act
 Nevill v Miller act
 Pratt v Pratt m f j
 Fay v Petroleum Engine Co ld act
 Johnson v Walker act
 Barlow & Jones ld v Bond act
 Cochrane v Dundonald act
 Reynolds v Loosemore act
 Trevelthan v James act
 Scott-Hall v Abingdon act
 Keating v Wright action set down with pleadings pursuant to direction of judge Nov 10, 1893
 Jones v Sutler act
 Smethurst v Mendahl act
 Re Thompson Williams v Cooke act & m f j
 Taylor v Walker act
 Evans v Ballard act
 Hutchison v Hill act
 Shepherd v Kearly act
 Holt v Produce Brokers Co ld counterclaim
- Causes for trial (without witnesses).
 French v Brinton spi case
 Horsfall v Birch m f j and motion by order, dated Dec 19, 1893
- Adjourned Summonses.
 In re Pickard Emsley v Mitchell Dowse v Wood amended
 In re L'Herminier, Mounsey v Mounsey restored
 In re Pratt Pratt v Pratt (pt hd)
 In re Sangster Green v Mockett
 In re Brown Brown v Stafford
 In re Pinchbeck Andrews v Sparham
 In re Aldridge Aldridge v Aldridge
 In re Naah Sweet v Naah Clement Smith v Lumley
 In re Belt Ward v Belt
 In re Warden Warden v Warden
 Re Tranter Watson v Whitehouse Attorney-Gen v North Metropolitan Tram Co
 In re Finsbury Chapel Trusts Stockall v Saunders
 In re Booth Booth v Booth Macleod v Bonser
 In re Gedge (expte School Board for London)
 Re Piercy Whitwam v Piercy
- Further Considerations.
 Faussett v Porter, Porter v De Quetteville fur con
 Russell v White fur con

Before Mr. Justice STIRLING.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
Bradley v Humphry act restored
Canadian Direct Meat Co v Isaacs
act restored
Vallance v Frappe act
Robinson v Heygate deft bkrupt
Aldin v Latimer Clark Muirhead &
Co, ld act
Withers v Ashdown act
Re Smart Smart v Bulman adjd
sums
C de Murrieta v de Murrieta act
Fooks v Cook act
Hutchinson v May act
Wood v Carry & Paxton act
Rait & Gardiner v Calder & Co act
King v English and Scottish Mer-
cantile Investments Trusts ld act
Bayley v Transvaal Mortgage Loan
& Co ld act
Saunders v Bescoby act
In re Geo Cox & Trustee Relief
Act adj sums to be treated as
wit act
In re Tanner Haines v Tanner
act
Robinson v Smith act
Cohen v Watkins act
Winter v Winter act and pet
Peek Winch & Co v National Pro-
vincial Bank of England, ld
act
Deuchar v Sutherland act
Re Morris Morris v Atherden act
Radcliffe v Jennings act
Jonas v Daniel act
Hamer v Hughes Metcalfe v
Hamer act
Re Llewelyn Crawhall v Llewelyn
act
Wright v Scott act and m for j
Devon and Cornwall Banking Co,
ld v Honey act
Re Dunn Howard v Dunn
Pittard v Cox act and adjd sums
Hookham v Ballard act
Cooke v Machen act
Thornwell v Lobb act
Wise v Metpn Electric Supply Co ld
act
Heatly v Hyde act
Heatly v Everett m f j (To come
on next after Heatly v Hyde
by order Aug 5, 93)
Wighton v Bischofwerder act
Faber v Jones act
Hunt v Life Association of Scotland
act and m f j
Eden v Studdy act
Palmer v Raphael act, m f j, and
adj sums
Mowll v Canell act
Mowll v Edwards act
Blanchetiere v Darmstatter act
Currie v Mackay act
Gibson v Alston act
Stringer v International Commercial
Co ld act
In re Pears, dec Pears v Collyer
act
The Edison & Swan United Electric
Light Co ld v H Binks & Co
act

Causes for Trial Without Witnesses
and Adjourned Summonses.
In re Ownsworth adj sum restored
pt hd
In re Bredon Bateman v Wade spc
In re The Guadarama Gold Mines
ld & Co's Acts adj sums
In re Whitehead Peacock v Lucas
adj sums
In re Morris Turner v Lacons adj
sums
Bevan v Briton Ferry, & Co adj
sums
In re The Irish Exhibition in Lon-
don ld adj sums
Heap v Knight act and m f j
In re Venn & Furne's Contracts
and V & P Act, 1871 adj sums

In re Barker Andrews v Barker
adj sums
In re Bridger Bridger v Bridger
adj sums
In re Tompison Att-Gen v Roots
adj sums
In re Markham Morgan v Damant
adj sums
In re Cramp Winch v Cramp adj
sums
Fishe v Hutchings & Co, ld adj
sums
Duke of Marlborough v Whitehead
adj sums
In re Burrard Jacobs v Cooper
adj sums
Re Neate and St Luke's Vestry, &
adj sums
Re E Boutflower one & adj sums
Re Brereton Sedger v Chambers
adj sums
Re Williams Tilly v Evans adj
act
Re Farmer Chapman v Lapham
adj sums
Wilnot v Olympic Music Hall, ld
m f j short
Re Gripper Harvey v Smith adj
sums
Re Jones Jones v Mortimer
Lonsdale v Craven m f j
Slark v Cox m f j short
Jennings v Hobson act
Dresser v Bill m f j
Further Considerations.
Re Robinson Robinson v Blad-
worth fur con
Field v Nichols fur con

Before Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.
Causes for trial (with witnesses).
Tyler v Bishop act
Bishopp v Venning act
Shorter v Tod Heatly act & m f j
Smith v Bridson act
In re Nell Neil v Neil act
Selby v Saunders act
Blackwell v Bent act
Sequah ld v Bailey act
Glynn v Steer act receiving order
against dft
Kemp v Barrow act
Ebbw Vale Steel, Iron and Coal Co
ld v Higson act (first wits day
after No 14)
Servian Bacon Curing Co ld (in
voluntary liquidation) v Marshall
act
Gt Western Ry Co v Cefn Cribbwr
Brick Co, ld act
Millar v Allen act (head of list by
order)
Montagu v Gye act and motn for
jdg
Wolf v Brown act deft Douglas
dec
Foulis v Baron de L'Isle and Dud-
ley act
The Enterprise Manufacturing Co
v S Nye & Co act
Matabeleland Co ld v British South
Africa Co act
Baden Powell v Wilson act
Lemmon v Webb act
Eaton v Daines act
Ford v Spanish Corpn ld act
Scott v Consolidated Bk ld act
and motn for jdg
Booth v Williams act
Blackledge v Anderton act
Anglo-French Exploration Co ld v
Greta Collieries ld act
Turnbull v West Riding Athletic
Club Leeds ld act for trial set
down without pleadings by order
Jan 16
Salt Union ld v Corbett act
Garnham v Garnham act
Cross v Hanbury motn for jdg tset
down by order, dated April 11,
1893, and adjd sums
Collie v Bloxham act
Garnett v Teller act

Nunn v Gibson adj sums ordered
to go into list of actions for trial
with wits by order, dated Nov 30,
1893
Mabbitt v Beech (1893—M—3060)
mta Mabbitt v Beech (1893—M—
—3168) mtn To come into list
after No 25
Whitaker v Dawson act
In re Smith, Adams v Alderton act
Ridler v Watkins act & m f j
In re Stericker, Coates v Porrett,
Smith v Porrett act
Richardson v Methley School Board
act
Watson v Baildon Local Board, &
act
In re Purdue, Cannon v Purdue pet
(set down in Witnesses List by
order)
Barningham v Taylor act
Appleby v Brazilian Government
Southern Ry Co ld act
Clarke v Curbishley act
Foster v Busby act
Martin v Barter & Co ld adj sums
(set down in Witnesses List by
order)
Barrow v Kent act
Oliver v Robins act
Goodman v Cory act
Lakeman v Oriental Transvaal
Land, & Co, ld act
Dunn v Vyse act set down with-
out pleadings by order
Olsen v Santamarina act
Cause for trial (without witnesses).
Beggs v Coney motn for judg
(short)
National Bank of Wales ld v Poynt-
on & Co ld motn for judg
(short)

Point of Law.
Lever v The Land Securities Co ld
De Carteret v The Same Co
question of law set down by order
dated August 3, 1893 (re-
stored)

Adjourned Summonses.
Re Graham Siddall v Graham
In re Cleverly Pocock v Allen
In re Lord Mowbray Mowbray v
Mowbray
In re Ramsay Sloley v Ramsay
(restored)
In re Schiff Schiff v Schiff
Welby v Still
James v Jones Slater v Jones
In re Good Good v Good
Hext v Beresford
In re Blake Pemberton v Blake
Re Hill Woodville v Hill
Re Selwyn Atherley v Selwyn
Re Milward one, & (taxation)
Re Hyde Turner v Chester plead-
ings (restored)

Further Considerations.
Mew v Wakeford 2nd fur con
Re Wright Gunnell v Wright fur
con adj sums

Before Mr. Justice VAUGHAN
WILLIAMS.
(Sitting as an additional Judge of
Chancery Division.)
Companies.
Petition.
Aluminium Co, ld & reduced petn
of Co to reduce capital

Companies (winding up).
Petitions.
Joseph Bull Sons & Co ld (petn of
M T Shaw & Co)
Glamorgan Central Permanent
Benefit Building Society (petn of
Co)
Industrial Securities Investment
Co ld (petn of E. A. Hamblin)
Elmore's Foreign & Colonial Patent

Copper Depositing Co ld (petn of
R J Meade)
Securities Insurance Co ld (petn of
A Serena)
Bidaon Railway and Mines ld (petn
of F Thora)
Equitable Mortgage Co (petn of Co)
Dawson Lyric Club (petn of C A R
Scott)
Anglo-Galician Syndicate ld (petn
of S Peet)
Madrid & Portugal Direct Railway
(Avila and Salamanca) ld (petn of
A D Frederickson)
Aladdin Primary Electric Battery
Co ld (petn of T Coad)
Mortgage Insurance Corporation ld
(petn of Rev J Miller)
Magyar Gold Mining Co ld (petn of
H C Vickerman and others)
Tamborcherry Estate Co, ld petn
of H Tolputt
Bloxwich Iron & Steel Co, ld petn
of J G Chapman & Co
Newington, Priddle, & Co, ld petn
of J Billie & anor
Bedford Park Stores, ld & Joint
Stock Co's Arrangement Act, 1870
petn of liquidators
Surrey & General Land Co, ld petn
of C C Rees
Invicta Works, ld petn of P G
Sturges
Steam Loop Co, ld petn of H D
Phillips
North British Water Gas Syndi-
cate, ld petn of W Neilson
Bargens Restaurants, ld petn of
Tottenham Lager Beer Brewery
& Ice Factory, ld

Action for Trial (with witnesses).
Ellis v Ranken, Ellis & Co ld

Court Summonses.
L J Wright & Co, ld (sums for
declaration as to misfeasance)
City of Worcester Tramways Co, ld
& The Midland Tramways Co, ld
(sums for leave to liquidator to
retain assets) part heard
Midland Tramways Co ld (sums to
register deed) pt hd
Lyric Club ld (sums by Capt A
Brownlow and others to set aside
proof)
Birmingham Compressed Air Power
Co ld (sums for leave to make
call)

Chamber Summonses.
Hereynia Copper Co ld (sums to
exclude name from list of contribs)
Industrial and General Trust ld v
South American and Mexican Co
ld (on order d 22-11-93)
Standard Gold Mining Co ld (sums
to appt J M Henderson, liq for
purpose of taking proceedings)

N.B.—The following case stands for
judgment but no day yet fixed
Anglo Austrian Printing and Pub-
lishing Union ld (sums for decln
as to misfeasance)

Before Mr. Justice ROMER.
Causes for trial (with witnesses).
Kenny v McCarthy act & m f j
(not before 22 Jan) (Under com-
promise)
Setterwall v Dorman, Brown & Co
act
In re Copland Mitchell v Bain act
(restored)
In re Gordon Gordon v Stuart act
(deft dead)
Roach v Roach act (plt bkrupt)
Transferred by Order dated 20th
July, 1893
Nobel's Explosives Co v Anderson
act (20 Jan after part heard)

Brunner Mond & Co ld v Winnington Salt Co ld act
In re Wratislaw Wratislaw v Savage act (S O until after acct delivd)
Seddon v Bateman act (dit bankrupt)
In re Peak Mort v Mansfield act S O until after trial of issues in Palatine Court
Saddbury v Lee & Glenn act (2nd day in sittings)
Parnell v Vickers act
Thornloe v Hill act
Thornloe v Read act

Transferred by order dated 20th November, 1893.

Reddish v Green act (Not before 11 May)

Page v Norfolk act part heard

London Freehold and Leasehold Property Co v Gooch & Cousens act (2nd day in sittings)

London Freehold and Leasehold Property Co v Gooch & Cousens act

Wynne v Corporation of West Ham act

Feast v Robinson & Fisher act

Wickett v Hart act

In re Fowler Collins v Ellis act & mota for judgt

Lowe v Smallman act & mota for judgt

Scrutton v Caustic Soda and Chlorine Syndicate ld act

Cowper v Stoneham act

Lincolnshire Publishing Co ld v Choice act & sums

Marrin v Hewson act (Not before 1 Feb)

Thorne-George v Godfrey act

Brieseman v Lambert act

Finley v Robinson act

Vereker v Gunning act

North British Rubber Co, ld v Mackintosh & Co, ld act

In re Hill Hill v Miles

Crossley v Temple act

Fletcher v G H Martin & Co act

Cuff v King act

Champ v Mayor of Southend on Sea act

English and American Machinery Co, ld v Union Boot & Shoe Co, ld act

Devan v Briton Ferry Works Re-construction Co, ld act
Salaman v Curtis act
Jones v Richard act
Richardson v Ridge act
Wenlock v Wenlock act
Bayman v Warwick act
Long v Jay mota to be treated as trial of act by order, dated July 21, 1893

Cannings v Scames act

Guardians of Poor of Hunlet Union v Ingram act

Evans v Rathbone act

Ricketts v Hill act

Jolly v Bath Bath v Jolly act

Lloyd's Bank ld v Birmingham District Land Co ld act

Minter v Carr act (order for discovery)

Pledge v Carr act (order for discovery)

Garner v Blazer Firelighter Co ld act

In re Palmer King v Ogg act

In re Lord Balls v Lord act

Mayor, &c. of Birmingham v Foster act

Brewer v Blackmore act

In re Barrett Webber v Loach act

In re The Maharajah Mysore Gold Mining Co ld & Co's Acts adj sums ordered to go into witness list

Local Board for district of Minehead v Luttrell act

Arbib v Henry act

Chatterton v Jackman act

Slattery v Glover act

Evans v Jewell act

In re Sharpe, Sharpe v Sharpe act

Morris v Andrew act

Midland Ry Co v Cave act

Moncur v Fox act

Wolf v Kent act

Harrison v Fell act

Gardiner v Army and Navy act (set down with the Co-operative Society ld pleads) by order, dated Nov 3, 1893

Baker v McConnell act

In re Brande, Brande v Biddulph act and judgt

Stuart v Grundy act

Whiting v Needham

Dadson v Cadman

In re an Arbin between Bald & ors & Jewell

Goddon v Bailey

Pollock v Hatton

Edwards v Marsh

Jacobs v Charles

Schlesinger v Thurlow

King v Heal

Hughes v Justin

Campbell v Christey

National Guardian Assce Co ld v Browns

Schlesinger v Thurlow & ors

Ramsden v Fox

In re a Solicitor v Expte Incorporated Law Soc

Bruff v Reynolds

Richmond Cedar Works ld v Hamilton

Martin v Edwards & anr

Pulling v Aldom

Wolf & Co ld v Campbell

Ball v Spickett

Dunlop v Equitable Benefit Building Soc

Ellesmere v Entwistle

Usher's Wiltshire Brewery ld v Dickens

Brain v Herrick

The Worcester City & County Banking Co & ors v Firbank, Pauling, & Co & anr

Martin & Wife v Trustees of British Museum

Yates v Evento

The Nassau Steam Press ld v Tyler & ors

Dobson & Sons v Kirby & anr

Cipri v Davies & ors

In re G H Llewellyn, J K White, and J Moxon, gent, &c Expte W

Lloyd (costs)

Blair and anr v Chidley and anr

Hammond v Elven

Moxham v Campbell

Burton v Maule

In re an Arbin between Spillers & Baker, ld and Ralli Bros

Darlow v Hartley

Willing v Stevens

Carnochan and anr v Wroot

Florsheim v Ramsden & Co

Spencer and ors v Blackman

In re a Solicitor v Expte Incorporated Law Soc

Lumley and anr v Philbrick

In re an Arbitration between Wyler & Calvert & Co

Moxham v Campbell

Richardson v Leutner

Allopp v Tompkins

Mozley v Billing & ors

Baker v Billings & ors

Wolf & Co v Curtis & Harvey

Figueiredo v Marks & ors

Rutherford & anr v Lewis

Simpson v Trumpy

Ehrmann Bros v Ehrmann

Holme & anor v Mayor &c of the Borough of Stockport

Stephens v Hair

Hurley v Checco

Wagstaff v Smith

Stigden v Hainsworth

Southchurch Brickfields Co ld v Legge & Co (De Crespigny claim) to be heard by Bruce, J (day to be fixed)

Elkington v Stent & ors

In re an arbitn between the owners of the Smack Godild & the owners of the Smack Lady Talbot

Cox & Lafone v Pratt

Anderson v Gorrie

John v Lewis

Hulbert & anr v Cathcart

Lewes v Rogers

Discount Banking Co of England & Wales ld v Sefton & anr

Bartlett v Digby

Varty v Higgins

Nicholson v London Chatham & Dover Ry Co

Neville v Tingey

Blair & Girling v Smith

Staniforth v Ryalls

Underwood v Lewis

CROWN PAPER.

For Judgment.

Met Pol Dist Wallen v Lister Magistrate's case (c.a.v. Dec 18, 1893 coram Hawkins, J., & Lawrence, J.)

Glemorganshire James v Jones Quarter Sessions special case applt's nial to quash (c.a.v. December 18, 1893, coram Hawkins, J., & Lawrence, J.)

For Argument.

Lancashire The Queen v Justices, &c, for the County of Lancaster Nial for mandamus to hear app against conviction at instance of P Wilson
Met Pol Dist Holland & anr v Wallen Magistrate's case
Staffordshire, Walsall Birch v Peake county court pl't's app

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

HELARY SITTINGS, 1894.

SPECIAL PAPER.

For Argument.

The Wimbledon & Putney Commons Conservators v Nicol part heard April 19, 1893, before Mr. Justice Wills and Mr. Justice Charles (S O until after trial of act) points of law

Musurus Bey, exor, &c v Gadban & ors, exors, &c part heard Nov 22, 1893, before Mr Justice Lawrence and Mr Justice Wright special case

Stern & ors v The Queen demurrer to petn of right

The North Eastern Ry Co v The Mayor, &c, of the Boro' of Thornaby on Tees special case

The Wallasey Local Board v The Mayor and Corps of Birkenhead special case

In re an Arbin between Messrs Ralli Bros and Messrs Spillers & Baker, ld special case

OPPOSED MOTIONS.

For Argument.

Whittack v Newman part heard Dec 7, 1893, before Mr Justice Wills & Mr Justice Collins

Flew v Smith & anr part heard June 5, 1893, to be heard by Mr Justice Grantham alone day to be fixed

In re an Arbitration between the London County Council and the London Street Trams Co

In re an Arbin between Same and Same

Pollock v Haiston to be heard by Mr Justice Day and Mr. Justice Collins

Pollock v Sharpe & anr to be heard by Mr Justice Day and Mr Justice Collins

In re a Solicitor Expte Incorporated Law Soc

Swyny v Harland

In re a Solicitor Expte Incorporated Law Soc (S O for further report)

In re a Solicitor Expte Incorporated Law Soc

Jaques v Thomas

National Bank of Wales ld v Collins

Brighton Blaker v Tillstone (Town Clerk of Brighton) Magistrate's case
 Lancashire, Ashton-under-Lyne Broadhurst Bros v Boardman county court dft's app
 Oldham Hoyle & Jackson & 42 ors v Assessment Committee of Oldham Union & ors quarter sessions special case (12 & 13 Vict. c. 45, s. 11)
 Durham Newby v Sims magistrate's case
 Same Same v Same magistrate's case
 Lincolnshire, Great Grimsby Crampin v Grimsby Cod Smack Mutual Inace Co county court dft's app
 Same Same v Same county court plt's app
 Southampton Baker v Herd Magistrate's case
 Flintshire The Queen v Roper, Esq., & ors Jj, and Ellis (expte Price) Nisi for certiorari for order
 Maldon Gozzett v Urban Sanitary Authority of Boro' of Maldon Magistrate's case
 Met Pol Dist The Queen v W Slade, Esq., Met Pol Mag & ors (expte Schindewolffs) Nisi for certiorari for convictions and orders
 Lancashire, Liverpool Cork Harbour Commrs v Joliffe & anr county court dft's app
 Hampshire, Lymington Crouch v Cooper county court plt's app
 Middlesex, Westminster Briggs v Lucas & Aird county court plt's app
 Lancashire, Manchester Dibb v Brooke & Sons county court dft's app
 Wilts In re Local Government Act, 1888 (expte County Council of Wilts & ors) Questions under Local Government Act, 1888
 London Nind v Nineteenth Century Building Society County Court dft's app
 Worcestershire The Queen v Rector, & St Clement & ors (expte Bozward) Nisi for mandamus to elect churchwarden
 Stockton on Tees Muther v Muther magistrate's case
 Devonshire Vance v Frost & ors magistrate's case
 Met Pol Dist Nixey v London County Council magistrate's case
 Surrey, Lambeth Miller v Sexton's Central Horse Repository county court dft's app
 Middlesex, Clerkenwell Hughes v Bonnell county court plaintiff's app
 Yorkshire, Todmorden Sutcliffe v Hebden Bridge Fustian, & Co county court dft's app
 Worcestershire The Queen v Wright (expte Bozward) Nisi for quo warranto as guardian of hop market
 Suffolk The Queen v Oakes, Esq., & ors, Jj, & c (expte Mumford) Nisi for mandamus to hear complaint
 Yorkshire, Kingston upon Hull Todd v Boyle county court plt's app
 London Comptoir Commercial de Charlevoi v Guthrie & Co county court plt's app
 Salop The Queen v Ethelston, Esq., and anr Jj, & c (ex pte Local Board for Whitechurch) nisi for mandamus to issue warrant
 Carmarthenshire, Llanelly Rees v Davies county court dft's app
 Gloucestershire, Bristol Cripps & ors v Hucker county court dft's app
 London The Queen v Registrar, & c, Stationers' Co (ex pte Tayleur) nisi for mandamus to register name as proprietor
 Surrey, Southwark Smith v Pearce county court dft's app
 London Long v Grant Mayor's Court, plt's app
 Norfolk The Queen v The Nar Valley Drainage Board (ex pte Bryan) nisi for mandamus to levy rate
 Yorkshire, Leeds Flatley v Malcolm county court dft's app
 Middlesex, Westminster Smith v Willmer (Du Bois, clmt) county court clmt's app
 Devonshire Tozer v Harris Magistrate's case
 London The Commercial Stock, & Corp'n v Rose Mayor's court plt's app
 Kent The Queen v The Company of the Proprietors of the Navigation of the River Medway indictment nisi for fine on conviction on indictment
 Gloucestershire, Cheltenham Blake v Kelly & anr county court plt's app
 Wiltshire, Swindon Welch v Morris county court dft's app
 Middlesex, Shoreditch Horsfall v Gimblett county court plt's app
 Derby The Mayor, & c, of Derby v Grudgings magistrate's case
 Lancashire, Preston Beeley v Preston & County Permanent Bldg Soc & anr Equity county court dft's app
 (To be continued.)

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

SMITH.—Dec. 29, at Perth-y-terfyn, Holywell, North Wales, the wife of HARRY T. SMITH, solicitor, of a daughter.
 WOODFALL.—Jan. 9, at Kaling, the wife of Robert Woodfall, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGE.

BELGRAVE—RICHARDSON.—Dec. 4th, at St. John's Church, Territet, Switzerland, by the Rev. F. Menzies Sankey, English Chaplain, Dairymple James Belgrave, barrister-at-law, Inner Temple, second son of the late Thomas Belgrave, of North Kilworth, Leicestershire, Commander R.N., to Isabel, third daughter of the late J. B. Richardson, Esq., of Sholey, county Durham, and of Mrs. Richardson, Villa Victoria, Clarens, Switzerland.

DEATH.

RAYNER.—Jan. 7, at Bishop's Teignton, South Devon, Robert Hyde Rayner, solicitor, of Stoke Lacey, Marple, and Cooper-street, Manchester, aged 40.

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS & LESSEES.—Before purchasing or renting a house have the Sanitary arrangements thoroughly examined by an expert from the Sanitary Engineering & Ventilation Co., 65, next the Meteorological Office, Victoria-st., Westminster (Estab. 1876), who also undertake the Ventilation of Offices, &c. —[ADVT.]

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, JAN. 5.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BLAKELEY HALL COLLIERY CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before March 1, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Howard Samuel Smith, 14, Waterloo st., Birmingham. Horton & Co, Birmingham, solers for liquidator

LEADS ART POTTERY, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 17, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Christian Nestle, 29, Red Lion sq. Dalton, Leeds, soler for liquidator

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

VICTORIA QUILT CO., LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Jan 3, directed to be heard at the Assize Courts, Strangeways, Manchester, on Monday, Jan 15. Crofton & Craven, 36, Brasenose st, Manchester, solers for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Jan 13

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

DOWLAIS FIREMEN'S SOCIETY, Corner House Inn, Dowlais, Glamorgan. Dec 30

GLENSFORD CO-OPERATIVE AND INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY, LIMITED, Egremont st, Glensford, Suffolk. Dec 30

INDUSTRIAL BAND OF HOPE SICK AND LIFE ASSURANCE JUVENILE FRIENDLY SOCIETY, 89 Market st, Farnworth, Lanes. Dec 30

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, JAN. 9.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

DAVIES & DAVIES, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Jan 4, directed to be heard on Jan 17. Alpe & Ward, 8, Serjeants' Inn, Fleet st, solers for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Jan 16

HAMMERSMITH, BAYSWATER, AND DISTRICT BANK, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Jan 2, directed to be heard on Jan 17. Naah & Co, 12, Queen st, Cheapside, solers for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Jan 16

HOTEL VICTORIA, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 22, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to John Milton Broad and Stanley Carr Boulter, 1, Walbrook. Linklater & Co, 3, Bond st, Walbrook, solers for liquidators

IDAHO MINING CO., LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 9, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Ronald Charles Power, Winchester House, Old Broad st. Rawlings & Rawlings, 8, Clifford's inn, solers for liquidator

INSURANCE PUBLISHING CO., LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Jan 8, directed to be heard on Jan 17. W. H. Smith & Son, Gresham House, solers for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Jan 16

MAROS PATENT STAMPED STEEL CHAIN CO., LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Jan 4, directed to be heard on Jan 17. Milne & Milne, 14, Clement's inn, Strand, solers for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Jan 16

SAXIGENUS SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented Jan 3, directed to be heard on Wednesday, Jan 17. Wild & Wild, 31, Lawrence lane, Cheapside, solers for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Jan 16

CREDITORS' NOTICES.

UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, JAN. 2.

ADAMS, SAMUEL, and CHARLES JENKIN BAYLIS, Great Windmill st, Proprietors of the Trocadero Music Hall Jan 31 Bird v Dorling, Kekewich, J. Payne & Son, Chancery lane

JONES, DAVID, Pantyrehwawr Gartholi, Cardigan, Farmer Jan 31 Jones v Edwards, Kekewich, J. Davies, Lampeter

JORDAN, MARY, Folkestone Feb 1 Hops v Jordan, Chitty, J. Bradley, Folkestone

WRIGHT, JOHN, Walton, Lanes, Gent Jan 29 Stokes v Wright, Registrar, Liverpool Kenion, Liverpool

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, JAN. 5.

CHADWICK, THOMAS, Gaythorn, Manchester, Smallware Manufacturer Feb 5 Chadwick v Chadwick, Registrar, Manchester Preston & Son, Manchester

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, DEC. 29.

ANDREWS, JOSEPH, Stowmarket, Builder Feb 7 Haywards & Peacock, Stowmarket

ARKWRIGHT, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Wilpshire, Lancaster Feb 14 Sandeman, Accrington

BABRON, NETTREVILLE JOHN, Eastbourne, Gent Feb 10 Hardman, Gracechurch st

BEST, FREDERICK JOHN, Wernmoigne, Dorset, Yeoman Jan 31 Fulton & Pysmith, Salisbury

CARPENTER, JOHN, Bristol, Gent Jan 13 Gilmore, Bristol

CHIEW, JAMES FERMOE, Leighton Buzzard, Gent Feb 1 Chow, Wanstead

DOEL, REV WILLIAM, Southwick Jan 31 Mann & Rodway, Trowbridge

EMMOTT, THOMAS, Halliwell, Lancaster, Provision Dealer Jan 30 Russell, Bolton

FISH, JOSEPH, Tunbridge Wells, Licensed Victualler Feb 9 Andrew & Cheale, Tunbridge Wells

HAIR, MARY, Tunbridge Wells, Widow Feb 9 Andrew & Cheale, Tunbridge Wells

MCVAY, CHARLES, Kentish Town rd, Pianoforte Manufacturer Feb 17 Bolton & Mote, Gray's inn square

RAND, JOSEPH, Hadleigh, Suffolk, Gent Feb 1 Grimwade, Hadleigh

REEVES, THOMAS, Bexley, Builder Jan 25 Armitage, Finsbury pavement

TINDALL, THOMAS WALKER, Hotel Belgravia, Esq Feb 8 Jackson & Jackson, Middleborough

WALKER, GEORGE, Birkenhead, Esq Feb 9 Garnett & Co, Liverpool

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, JAN. 2.

BATSON, JOHN, Randolph gardens, Gent Feb 10 May, Golden sq

BESWICK, JAMES, Stockport, Provision Dealer Jan 17 Redfern, Stockport

BIRD, JOHN GOULDING, Brierley Hill, Stafford, Grocer Feb 7 Watson, Stockport

BRAY, DAVID, Golcar, Woollen Manufacturer Feb 17 Laycock & Co, Huddersfield
 BRETT, THOMAS, Lincoln's Inn, Barrister at Law Feb 14 Flaks, Bedford row
 BRINDLEY, THOMAS, Stockport, Butcher Feb 1 Newton, Stockport
 BRINDLEY, ELIZABETH HANNAH, Stockport, Widow Feb 1 Newton, Stockport
 BURRAGE, ELIZABETH, Paddington, Spinster Feb 13 Cooper & Bake, Portman st
 BURROWS, CHARLES, Paddington, Esq Feb 8 Jull & Godfrey, Queen Anne's Gate
 COOK, JOHN, South Shields, Butcher Jan 27 Remondson, South Shields
 DAVIES, AMY, Moseley, Widow Jan 31 Canning & Canning, Birmingham
 DUNCAN, ANDREW, North Ferry, York, Gent Feb 17 Hollams & Co, Mincing lane
 DURHAM, HENRY, Willesden park, Gent Feb 10 May, Golden sq
 EDGE, EDWARD, Wharfedale, Lancs, Gent Jan 30 Finch & Johnson, Preston
 EMMERSON, CHARLES, Stanhope, Durham, Innkeeper Feb 5 Hoagson, Stanhope
 ENGLAND, HANNAH, Deptford, Spinster Jan 31 Sturton, Holbeach
 GALPIN, THOMAS PATTEN, Brixton Doverell, Wilts, Farmer Feb 2 Wilson & Sons, Salisbury
 GRIMWOOD, JOHN DAVID, Ipswich, Accountant March 25 Jackman & Sons, Ipswich
 HAMILTON, GEORGE ALEXANDER, Wincanton Jan 31 Rutter & Rutter, Wincanton
 HOFFMAN, ISABELLA ELIZA, Putney Heath, Widow Feb 14 Kimber & Co, Lombard st
 HOWARD, HON FREDERICK CHARLES, Evelyn grds, Captain Feb 1 Willett, Arundel st
 HUNTER, THOMAS MARTIN, Southport, Gent Jan 31 Williams, Southport
 JEFFERY, JANE, Bexley Heath, Widow Jan 31 Carnegie, Queen Victoria st
 JEFFERY, JOHN LUTON, Bexley Heath, Gent Jan 31 Carnegie, Queen Victoria st

KEELY, JOSEPH ALFRED, Bristol, Licensed Victualler Feb 2 Barker, Bristol
 KENTON, HENRY, Starwix, Carlisle Jan 30 E & Kighley J Hough, Carlisle
 KIRKPATRICK, WILLIAM, Penrith, Hotel Keeper Jan 30 Beaymire & Shepherd, Penrith
 KNOWLES, ARTHUR, Wellington, New Zealand, Clerk Jan 10 Wilkins & Co, Gresham house
 KNOWLES, FRANCIS WILLIAM, Wellington, New Zealand Jan 10 Wilkins & Co, Gresham house
 MCLEAREN, JOHN HAGART, Birkenhead Feb 14 Garnet & Co, Liverpool
 MITCHELL, ROY JOSHUA, Barford, St. Martin, Wilts Feb 7 Wilde & Co, College hill
 ROSE, JOHN, Keighley, Yorks Feb 24 Naylor, Keighley
 ROWLAND, STEPHEN NEATE, Waddon, Surrey, Gent Jan 31 Rowland & Hutchinsons, Croydon
 RUGG, ISABEL AGNES, Bristol Feb 2 Barker, Bristol
 SAUL, EVA ELIZABETH, Bournemouth Jan 31 E & Kighley J Hough, Carlisle
 STEPHEN, ELIZABETH SARAH MARGARET, St Leonards on Sea, Spinster March 1
 STOUT, GEORGE, South Shields, Insurance Agent Jan 27 Remondson, South Shields
 TAYLOR, JOHN, Leeds, Gent March 1 Brooks, Leeds
 TERNETT, JANE EUPHEMIA, South Norwood hill, Widow Jan 19 Barfield & Child, Plowden bldgs
 TIDY, HENRY LOW, Hampstead, Veterinary Surgeon Jan 31 Double, Jewin crescent
 TUCKER, CHARLES, Euston rd, Cab Builder Feb 19 'Boydell, South sq
 WALLACE, ELIZA, Bayswater, Widow Feb 12 Cooper & Bake, Portman st
 WINCHESTER, WILLIAM, Brighton, Gent Feb 28 Stevens & Co, Brighton
 WOOLMER, MARGARET, Beccles, Suffolk, Spinster Feb 12 Cooper & Bake, Portman st

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, JAN. 5.
 RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADAMS, WILLIAM BROOK, Highwell, Devon, Builders Exeter Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 3
 ANDERSON, THOMAS, King's Lynn, Innkeeper King's Lynn Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 3
 APPELBY, GEORGE FREDERICK, Horbury, Yorks, Waggon Repairer Wakefield Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 BISHOP, MATILDA, Maccofield, Confectioner Maccofield Pet Dec 30 Ord Dec 30
 BODEN, FRANCIS GARDNER, Moira, Leicester, Licensed Victualler Burton on Trent Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 BOWMAN, WILLIAM DAWSON, Tottenham, Upholsterer Edmonton Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 BRASSINGTON, GEORGE JOHN, Thurstaston Marsh, Derby, Farmer Derby Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 CARVELL, SYDNEY ERNEST, Leicester, Trimmer Leicester Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 CHANNON, FREDERICK GEORGE, Swansea, Butcher Swansea Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 COMY, A C H, Nicholls sq, Hackney rd, Pianoforte Dealer High Court Pet Dec 16 Ord Jan 2
 CRAMP, HENRY, Chingford, Butcher Edmonton Pet Dec 30 Ord Dec 30
 DALE & WAITES, West Stanley, Durham, Drapers Newcastle on Tyne Pet Dec 16 Ord Jan 2
 DAVISON, JOHN ROBERT, Rochester, Waterman Rochester Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 DEL RIBGO, MIGUEL, Remenham, Berks, Hotel Keeper Reading Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 DOUBLEDAY, JOHN, Wisbech, Butcher King's Lynn Pet Dec 30 Ord Dec 30
 GUN, CHARLES, Newport, Tailor Newport, Mon Pet Dec 15 Ord Jan 3
 HAYMAN, OWEN, Exeter, Fish Dealer Exeter Pet Dec 30 Ord Dec 30
 HRAF, GEORGE, Middle Hulton, Lancs, Fruit Merchant Bolton Pet Dec 27 Ord Jan 2
 HIGSON, JOHN WILLIAM, Preston, Solicitor Preston Pet Dec 12 Ord Jan 2
 HOLMES, THOMAS, Leighton Buzzard, Dairyman Luton Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 HUCKLEBERRY, WILLIAM, Englishcombe, Som, Beer Retailer Bath Pet Dec 5 Ord Jan 1
 KIMBERLEY, JOSEPH, Smithwick, Shoe Dealer West Bromwich Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 LAMB, GEORGE, Kingston upon Hull, Surgeon Kingston upon Hull Pet Nov 23 Ord Jan 2
 LEE, HENRY ALFRED, Wisbech, Baker King's Lynn Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 LEVYSON, EDWARD, and ALFRED LEVYSON, Hoxton st, Tailors High Court Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 LYN, ESTHER, Tunbridge Wells, Ladies' Outfitter Tunbridge Wells Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 MARGUETTES, JAMES, Kingland rd, Pickle Manufacturers High Court Pet Nov 23 Ord Jan 3
 MARTIN, JOHN, Hanbury, Farmer Worcester Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 MAYNARD, JOSEPH EDWARD, Bristol, Ironmonger Bristol Pet Dec 23 Ord Jan 1
 MEE, FRANCIS HENRY, Loughborough, Joiner Leicester Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 MERRITT, FRANK, Newcastle under Lyme, Milk Seller Hanley Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 MINCHIN, CHARLES CHERRY, St Leonard's on Sea, Lieutenant-General in H. M's Army Hastings Pet Dec 9 Ord Jan 2
 MORRISON, JOHN WILLIAM, Walthamstow, Timber Merchant High Court Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 MOULD, JOHN HENRY, Smithwick, Farmer West Bromwich Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 NEWMAN, GEORGE, Pudding lane, Fish Salesman High Court Pet Dec 16 Ord Jan 3
 NICHOLS, HENRY SUMMERS, Wareham, Dorset, Gas Fitter Poole Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 PARRY, WILLIAM THOMAS, Farnside, Glam, Colliery Weigher Pontypridd Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 PILSON, JOHN, Ludlow, Salop, Haulier Leominster Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 RAFAELI, MORRIS, Goodge st, Tailor High Court Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3

ROBERTS, GWYN, Barmouth, Merioneth, Widow Aberystwith Pet Dec 18 Ord Jan 2
 ROGGE, IVON, Maida Vale, Laec Agent High Court Pet Nov 30 Ord Jan 1
 SPACKMAN, HENRY, Hinton Blewett, Somerset, Licensed Victualler Wells Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 SPIKES, JOHN, Spalding, Sugar Boiler Peterborough Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 STONE, WILLIAM, Kingston upon Hull, Tobaccoist Kingston upon Hull Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 STRONG, W F High Court Pet Nov 30 Ord Jan 1
 SYKES, WILLIAM, Castleford, Yorks, Builder Wakefield Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 TAYLOR, GEORGE JOHNSON, Handsworth, Electro Plate Manufacturer Birmingham Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 2
 UNDERHILL, EDWIN, Birmingham, Grocer's Manager Birmingham Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 WIMPERY, JOSEPH, Dunsley, Holmfirth, Milner Huddersfield Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 WOODCOCK, ROBERT, Silverdale, Staffs Hanley Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 WRIGHT, EDWARD OVERTON, Great Grimby, Butcher's Assistant Great Grimby Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Dec 22:—
 BEVAN, FREDERICK AUGUSTUS, Stockton on Tees, Ironmonger Stockton on Tees Pet Dec 16 Ord Dec 16

FIRST MEETINGS.

BAINES, HERBERT DAVID, Leeds, Fish Dealer Jan 15 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
 BARNES, JOHN CHARLES, Wimbomb, Commission Agent Jan 12 at 12.30 Off Rec, Salisbury
 CARVELL, SYDNEY ERNEST, Leicester, Haberdasher Jan 12 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 CHAMBERS, JOHN, Tipton, Haulier Jan 12 at 11 Off Rec, Dudley
 CRASOR, RICHARD LOVELL, Monmouth, Builder's Merchant Jan 12 at 2.30 King's Head Hotel, Newport, Mon
 DAVISON, JOHN ROBERT, Rochester, Waterman Jan 15 at 11.30 Off Rec, High st, Rochester
 ELLIS, JOHN LEWIS, Cardiff, Ship Broker Jan 19 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Queen st, Cardiff
 FAULKNER, WILLIAM EDWARD, Deeping St. James, Lincs, Coachbuilder Jan 19 at 12 Law Courts, Peterborough
 FISH, HENRY ALFRED, Stoke Newington, Jeweller's Assistant Jan 19 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 FRANCIS, JOSEPH, Reading, Grocer Jan 15 at 12 Queen's Hotel, Reading
 FORTWAGLER, FRANCIS ADOLPH, Neath, Jeweller Jan 12 at 3 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 GALLAGHER, PETER, Pontonville rd, Lodging house Keeper Jan 16 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 HAINES, THOMAS, Folkestone, Plumber Jan 19 at 9 Off Rec, 73, Castle st, Canterbury
 HARRIS, HERMAN, Tredgare, Clothier Jan 16 at 12 Off Rec, 65, High st, Merchyt Tyddl
 HATTON, JOHN, Clifford's Meane, Glos, Tanner Jan 13 at 3 Bell Hotel, Gloucester
 HEAD, FREDERICK, Doddington grove, Labourer Jan 12 at 11.30 24, Railway approach, London Bridge
 HRAF, GEORGE, Middle Hulton, Fruit Merchant Jan 15 at 3 16, Wood st, Bolton
 HUBBARD, CHARLES JOHN, Stoke Newington rd, Licensed Victualler Jan 16 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 IRELAND, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Camden Town, Leather Seller Jan 12 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 JAMES, RALPH, Pontypool, Builder Jan 12 at 12 Off Rec, Gloucester Bank chmbrs, Newport, Mon
 MATTICK, WALTER EDWARD, Midmore Norton, Saddler Jan 17 at 1.15 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Corn st, Bristol
 MEE, FRANCIS HENRY, Loughborough, Joiner Jan 15 at 12.30 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 PULLEN, WILLIAM GEORGE, 6, Titchfield st, Fruiterer Jan 16 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 RIGBY, WILLIAM, St James's End, Northants, Venetian Blind Manufacturer Jan 13 at 12.45 County Court bldgs, Northampton
 ROE, GEORGE HENRY, Blackpool, Cycle Dealer Jan 15 at 2.30 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 RUSKAY, FREDERICK, Howelsfield, Glos, Farmer Jan 12 at 11.30 Off Rec, Gloucester Bank chmbrs, Newport, Mon

SCHAEFER, WALTER, Finsbury pavement, China Importer Jan 15 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 SMORY, EDWIN, Romsey, Ironmonger Jan 17 at 3 Off Rec, 4, East st, Southampton
 SIMPSON, HENRY, Leeds, Grocer Jan 15 at 12 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
 STEWART, ALAN, Blackpool, Wardrobe Dealer Jan 15 at 2 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 WIGGINGTON, JOHN WILLIAM, Melton Mowbray, Grazier Jan 12 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 WILLIAMS, DAVID OWEN, Swansea, Bookseller Jan 12 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 WILLIAMS, EVAN, Pontypridd, Carpenter Jan 16 at 3 Off Rec, 65, High st, Merchyt Tyddl
 WILLIAMS, SIDNEY, Fieckwood, Tailor Jan 15 at 3 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 WINCHESTER, HERBERT, Hurstmonceaux, Sussex, Builder Jan 15 at 12.15 17, High st, Lewes

ADJUDICATIONS.

ADAMS, WILLIAM BROOK, Newton Abbot, Builders Exeter Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 ANDERSON, THOMAS, King's Lynn, Innkeeper King's Lynn Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 APPELBY, GEORGE FREDERICK, Horbury, Yorks, Waggon Repairer Wakefield Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 BARBER, JOHN CHARLES, Wimbomb, Dorset, Commission Agent Poole Pet Dec 22 Ord Dec 30
 BISHOP, MATILDA, Maccofield, Confectioner Maccofield Pet Dec 29 Ord Dec 30
 BRASSINGTON, GEORGE JOHN, Thurstaston Marsh, Derby, Farmer Derby Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 BOOKLEY, MICHAEL JOSEPH CUNNINGHAM, Maiden lane, Ecclesiastical Warehouseman High Court Pet Dec 14 Ord Dec 30
 CARVELL, SYDNEY ERNEST, Leicester, Trimmer Leicester Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 CHANNON, FREDERICK GEORGE, Swansea, Butcher Swansea Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 DAVIES, DAVID, Annanford, Carmarthen, Timber Merchant Carmarthen Pet Nov 7 Ord Jan 2
 DAVISON, JOHN ROBERT, Rochester, Waterman Rochester Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 DEL RIBGO, MIGUEL, Remenham, Berks, Hotel Keeper Reading Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 DOUBLEDAY, JOHN, Wisbech, Butcher King's Lynn Pet Dec 30 Ord Dec 30
 DOWLE, WILLIAM THOMAS, Dover, Builder Canterbury Pet Dec 16 Ord Jan 2
 HAYMAN, OWEN, Exeter Fish Dealer Exeter Pet Dec 30 Ord Dec 30
 HRAF, GEORGE, Middle Hulton, Lancs, Fruit Merchant Bolton Pet Dec 19 Ord Jan 2
 HOLMES, THOMAS, Wingate, Durham, Builder Sunderland Pet Dec 8 Ord Dec 30
 HUBBARD, CHARLES JOHN, Stoke Newington rd, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Dec 12 Ord Jan 1
 HUGHES, ALFRED, Brentwood, Oilman Chelmsford Pet Nov 23 Ord Dec 30
 IRELAND, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Camden Town, Leather Seller High Court Pet Dec 22 Ord Dec 30
 JONES, ROBERT, Llanyfryn, Carnarvon, Farmer Bangor Pet Dec 14 Ord Jan 1
 LANE, JOSEPH EDWIN, Kennington, Licensed Victualler Windsor Pet Nov 24 Ord Jan 2
 LEE, HENRY ALFRED, Wisbech, Baker King's Lynn Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 LEVY, ALFRED, Gent High Court Pet Nov 10 Ord Jan 3
 LYN, ESTHER, Tunbridge Wells Tunbridge Wells Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 MARTIN, JOHN, Hanbury, Worcester, Farmer Worcester Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 MAYNARD, JOHN HENRY, West Norwood, Timber Merchant High Court Pet Dec 7 Ord Dec 30
 MEE, FRANCIS HENRY, Loughborough, Joiner Leicester Pet Dec 31 Ord Jan 1
 MERRITT, FRANK, Newcastle under Lyme, Milk Seller Hanley Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 MOLYNEUX, NATHAN, Lancaster, Accountant Preston Pet Dec 16 Ord Jan 2
 MOULD, JOHN HENRY, Smithwick, Farmer West Bromwich Pet Dec 30 Ord Jan 3
 NICHOLS, HENRY SUMMERS, Wareham, Dorset, Gas Fitter Poole Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1

NOYCE, GLADSTONE, Romney, Grocer Southampton Pet Nov 29 Ord Jan 1
 OBBIE, BENJAMIN HERBERT, High st, Hampstead, Grocer High Court Pet Dec 13 Ord Dec 30
 PARKY, WILLIAM THOMAS, Ferndale, Glam, Colliery Wighier Pontypridd Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 PILSON, JOHN, Ludlow, Salop, Haulier Loominster Pet Dec 29 Ord Jan 1
 RAFFAEL, MORRIS, Goodge st, Tailor High Court Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 SHACKLETON, JOSEPH, Kingston upon Hull, Auctioneer Bradford Pet Nov 23 Ord Jan 1
 SKINNER, RICHARD, Reading, Iron Merchant Reading Pet Nov 15 Ord Jan 2
 SPACKMAN, HENRY, Hinton Blewett, Somerset, Licensed Victualler Wells Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 SPIKES, JOHN, Spalding, Sugar Boiler Peterborough Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 2
 SYKES, WILLIAM, Castleford, Yorks, Builder Wakefield Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 WIMPENY, JOSEPH, Holmfirth, Milner Huddersfield Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 WOODCOCK, ROBERT, Silverdale, Staffs Hanley Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 2
 WRIGHT, EDWARD OVERTON, Gt Grimsby, Butcher's Assistant Gt Grimsby Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 1
 WRIGHT, WALTER, Hastings, Jobmaster Hastings Pet Dec 25 Ord Jan 2

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Dec 22:-
 BAYAT, FREDERICK AUGUSTUS, Stockton on Tees, Ironmonger Stockton on Tees Pet Dec 16 Ord Dec 16

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED AND ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

MARLOW, GEORGE HENRY, Mansfield, Notts, Engineer's Storekeeper Nottingham Rec Ord and Adjud Nov 7 Rescued and Annulled Dec 20

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

FAYER, FRANCIS, Exeter, Turf Commission Agent Exeter Adjud April 15, 1891 Annulled Dec 7, 1893

London Gazette—TUESDAY, JAN. 9.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADAMS, JOHN, Kingston upon Hull, Hardware Dealer Kingston upon Hull Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 ANDREWS, GEORGE, Hereford, Builder Hereford Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 BARHAM, JOHN HENRY, Weston Colville, Cambs, Grocer Cambridge Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 BENNETT, JOHN, Wednesbury, Draper Walsall Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 BERRY, JOHN, Padham, Shoemaker Burnley Pet Jan 5 Ord Jan 5
 BLACKMON, GEORGE, Cardiff, Fancy Draper Cardiff Pet Dec 18 Ord Jan 2
 BURNETT, WILLIAM, Illogan, Cornwall, Mason Truro Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 CARR, THOMAS HAY, Horsforth Leeds Pet Dec 16 Ord Jan 5
 CHAPMAN, JOHN, Cardiff Cardiff Pet Dec 13 Ord Jan 2
 COLLINGSWOOD, HENRY WALTER CLIPHANT, Clayworth, Notts, Gent Lincoln Pet Oct 20 Ord Jan 5
 COOKE, GEORGE, Southport, Auctioneer Liverpool Pet Nov 23 Ord Jan 5
 FENTON, HENRY, Gilmorton, Leicestershire, Farmer Leicester Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6
 FORSTER BROTHERS, Old Bethnal Green rd, Timber Merchants High Court Pet Dec 21 Ord Jan 5
 GARCIA, HENRY, Duke st, Aldgate High Court Pet Dec 6 Ord Jan 5
 GRIFFITHS, CHARLES JOHN, Willeddon June High Court Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 HANBY, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Rotherham, Grocer Sheffield Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 HANCOCK, WILLIAM OLDFIELD, East Dulwich High Court Pet Dec 15 Ord Jan 5
 HAWTREY, CHARLES H., Comedy Theatre, Actor High Court Pet Dec 12 Ord Jan 5
 INGLIS, HUBERT CHARLES, Manchester, Drysalter Manchester Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 4
 ISAACS, NATHAN, Edgware rd, Clothier High Court Pet Jan 5 Ord Jan 5
 KELLA, RICHARD, Ventradyodwg, Glam, Builder Cardiff Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 KIDGER, EDWARD, Beeston, Farmer Nottingham Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 MASSEY, WILLIAM, Warrington, Monumental Mason Warrington Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6
 MATHEWS, CHARLES, Northwich, Saddler Nantwich Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 MAY, HENRY, Norwich, Tailor Norwich Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 MILLIS, HENRY CHARLES, Cardiff, Teacher of Navigation Cardiff Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 MORRIS, CHRISTOPHER THOMAS, Llanwornno, Glam, Painter Aberdare Pet Jan 5 Ord Jan 5
 MORRIS, ANGELOINA, Workop, Hotel Keeper Sheffield Pet Jan 5 Ord Jan 5
 NEWHAM, FRANK SADDLER, Sutton on the Hill, Farmer Derby Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6
 NIXON, THOMAS, Reading, Surgeon Reading Pet Jan 5 Ord Jan 5
 OLIVE, JOHN, Summersdoon, Lancs, Wagon Builder Bolton Pet Dec 11 Ord Jan 4
 PHARAOH, JAMES DAWSON, Carnforth, Innkeeper Preston Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 REECH, JOHN WOOD, Liverpool, Draper Liverpool Pet Dec 30 Ord Jan 6
 ROBERTS, LAURA, Cwrt Farm, Aberdare, Spinster Portmadoc Pet Dec 13 Ord Jan 5
 SAUNDERS, GEORGE, Yazor, Hereford, Carpenter Hereford Pet Jan 5 Ord Jan 5
 SMITH, WILLIAM FULMER MAITLAND, Llanymmarch Wells, Hotel Proprietor Newtown Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 STOKES, EDWARD, Sidcup, Livery Stable Keeper Croydon Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4

STORAR, JAMES, and ROBERT STORAR, JATOW, Builders Newcastle on Tyne Pet Dec 30 Ord Jan 4
 TADOR, ALFRED, Hartwood sq, Corn Merchant High Court Pet Dec 9 Ord Jan 4
 WALFORD, FRANCES JOHN, Box, Wilts, Grocer Bath Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Dec 15:-
 BEDINGFIELD, JAMES, Beddingfield, Farmer Ipswich Pet Dec 9 Ord Dec 9

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Jan 5:-
 ROBERTS, GWEN, Barmouth, Widow Aberystwith Pet Dec 13 Ord Jan 2

FIRST MEETINGS.

ADAMS, WILLIAM BROOK, Newton Abbot, Builder Jan 16 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Bedford circus, Exeter
 ANDREWS, GEORGE, Hereford, Builder Jan 19 at 10 2, Off st, Hereford
 APPLEBY, GEORGE FREDERICK, Horbury, Yorks, Waggon Repairer Jan 16 at 3 1 Rec, Bond ter, Wakefield
 ASHWOOD, ROBERT, Manchester, Bleacher and Dyer Jan 16 at 2 30 Ogden's chmbrs, Bridge st, Manchester
 BARNETT, CATHERINE, Smethwick, Milkdealer Jan 21 at 2 County Court, West Bromwich
 BROOKMAN, WILLIAM, Sheldon, Builder Jan 18 at 12 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
 BODEN, FRANCIS GARDINER, Moira, Leicester, Licensed Victualler Jan 17 at 11 30 Midland Hotel, Station st, Burton on Trent
 BOND, JOSEPH RODENHURST, Crewkerne, Builder Jan 16 at 1 George Hotel, Crewkerne
 BOYCOTT, JOSEPH, Parkgate, Yorks, Miner Jan 19 at 3 Off Rec, Figgree lane, Sheffield
 BRASINGTON, GEORGE JOHN, Thurstaston Marsh, Derby, Farmer Jan 16 at 12 Off Rec, St James's chmbrs, Derby
 BURNETT, WILLIAM, Illogan, Cornwall, Mason Jan 17 at 12 30 Off Rec, Boswell st, Truro
 CLARKE, GEORGE, Birmingham, Baker Jan 17 at 11 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
 COCKER, HANLEY, Royton, Lancs, Mill Manager Jan 17 at 3 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Queen st, Oldham
 COE, EDWARD THOMAS, Aldeburgh, Suffolk, Veterinary Surgeon Jan 16 at 12 Off Rec, 36, Princes st, Ipswich
 COMYN, A. C. H., Nichol sq, Hackney rd, Pianoforte Dealer Jan 16 at 2 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 CONNAN, ALEXANDER GRAY, Blackburn, Schoolmaster Jan 17 at 1 30 County Court house, Blackburn
 COOKE, JAMES RANDALL, Oldbury, Worcester, Schoolmaster Jan 24 at 2 County Court, West Bromwich
 COWIE, BROTHERS, Middleborough, Painters Jan 17 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middleborough
 COWLEY, ARTHUR GEORGE, Hereford, Hosier Jan 10 at 10 2, Off st, Hereford
 DUMAS, ROBERT, Walcott, Innkeeper Jan 17 at 11 30 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
 HANBY, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Rotherham, Yorkshire, Grocer Jan 19 at 3 30 Off Rec, Figgree lane, Sheffield
 HAYMAN, OWEN, Exeter, Fish Dealer Jan 16 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Bedford circus, Exeter
 HAYWOOD, WILLIAM CHARLES, Hereford, Machinist Jan 19 at 12 2, Off st, Hereford
 LAURENCE, HENRY, Wigton, Leics, Colonel Jan 20 at 12 30 Off Rec, 1, Bertrigg st, Leicester
 LEVYSON, EDWARD, and ALFRED LEVYSON, Hoxton st, Tailors Jan 16 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 MAROTTE, JAMES, and AYMERT SARAH ALLEN, Kingland rd, Olimes Jan 17 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 MATTHEWS, SAMUEL, Countesthorpe, Leics, Farmer Jan 16 at 12 30 Off Rec, 1, Bertrigg st, Leicester
 MAY, HENRY, Norwich, Tailor Jan 17 at 3 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 MAYNARD, JOSEPH EDWARD, Bristol, Ironmonger Jan 17 at 3 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Corn st, Bristol
 MCCORMICK, FREDERICK, Ilkeston, Clerk in Holy Orders Jan 19 at 2 30 Off Rec, St James's chmbrs, Derby
 MCGAWLEY, MICHAEL JAMES, Newcastle on Tyne, Provision Dealer Jan 17 at 12 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
 MILLS, WILLIAM HENRY, Neath, Glam, Jeweller Jan 16 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 MORRISON, JOHN WILLIAM, Walthamstow, Timber Merchant Jan 16 at 2 30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 NEWHAM, GEORGE, Pudding lane, Fish Salesman Jan 18 at 2 30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 NICHOLS, HENRY SUMMERS, Wareham, Dorset, Gas Fitter Jan 17 at 12 30 Off Rec, Salisbury
 OLIVE, JOHN, Summersdoon, Wagon Builder Jan 17 at 3 16, Wood st, Bolton
 PENT, JOHN BACHT, Smethwick, Brewer's Agent Jan 21 at 2 County Court, West Bromwich
 PICKERING, JOHN GARTON, Cleethorpes, Builder Jan 17 at 11 Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Great Grimsby
 PRICE, WILLIAM MARION, Evesham, Innkeeper Jan 18 at 10 30 Off Rec, Worcester
 PROUD, JAMES, Hartlepool, Labourer Jan 18 at 2 Off Rec, 25, John st, Sunderland
 RAPER, THOMAS, Bowdery, York, Pig Dealer Jan 23 at 11 30 Court house, Northallerton
 RAPHAEL, MORRIS, Goodge st, Tailor Jan 17 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 ROBERTS, THOMAS, Holmer, Hereford, Auctioneer Jan 19 at 10 2, Off st, Hereford
 ROGEE, IVON, Malda vale, Loco Agent Jan 18 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 ROWLEY, SAMUEL, Birmingham, Commission Agent Jan 17 at 11 30 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
 SAUNDERS, GEORGE, Yazor, Hereford, Carpenter Jan 19 at 10 2, Off st, Hereford
 STRONG, W F Jan 17 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey at
 SYKES, WILLIAM, Castleford, Yorks, Builder Jan 16 at 11 Off Rec, Bond ter, Wakefield
 TAYLOR, ALFRED, Ross, Hereford, Innkeeper Jan 19 at 10 2, Off st, Hereford
 WALL, JOHN, Tenbury, Gardener Jan 16 at 2 15 Miller Corbet, Solicitor, Kidderminster
 WIMPENY, JOSEPH, Holmfirth, Milner Jan 17 at 11 Off Rec, 5, Queen st, Huddersfield

ADJUDICATIONS.

ADAMS, JOHN, Kingston upon Hull, Hardware Dealer Kingston upon Hull Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 BARHAM, JOHN HENRY, Weston Colville, Grocer Cambridge Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 BENNETT, JOHN, Wednesbury, Draper Walsall Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 BERRY, JOHN, Padham, Shoemaker Burnley Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 5
 BLACKMON, GEORGE, Cardiff, Glam, Fancy Draper Cardiff Pet Dec 18 Ord Jan 5
 BODEN, FRANCIS GARDINER, Moira, Leicester, Licensed Victualler Burton on Trent Pet Jan 1 Ord Jan 4
 BRIGHT, EDWARD BRAILFORD, Fimico, Gents High Court Pet Sept 5 Ord Jan 6
 BURNETT, WILLIAM, Illogan, Cornwall, Mason Truro Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 CHAPMAN, JOHN, Cardiff Cardiff Pet Dec 13 Ord Jan 5
 FENTON, HENRY, Gilmorton, Leics, Farmer Leicester Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6
 GALLAGHER, PETER, Pentonville rd, Lodging house Keeper High Court Pet Dec 18 Ord Jan 6
 GILL, FRANCIS, Upper East Smithfield, Pabliian High Court Pet Dec 11 Ord Jan 6
 HANBY, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Rotherham, Grocer Sheffield Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 HIGSON, JOHN WILLIAM, Preston, Solicitor Preston Pet Dec 13 Ord Jan 4
 HOLWAY & PARSONS, Swansea, Builders Swansea Pet Dec 6 Ord Jan 4
 HUCKLEBRIDGE, WILLIAM, Englishchmbrs, Som, Beer Retailer, Bath Pet Dec 5 Ord Jan 5
 ISAACS, NATHAN, Edgware rd, Clothier High Court Pet Jan 5 Ord Jan 6
 KIDGER, EDWARD, Beeston, Farmer Nottingham Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 KIMBERLEY, JOSEPH, Smethwick, Boot Dealer West Bromwich Pet Jan 3 Ord Jan 3
 MASSEY, WILLIAM, Warrington, Monumental Mason Warrington Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6
 MAY, HENRY, Norwich, Tailor Norwich Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 MCANALLY, DAVID LANCASTER, Finsdilly, Clerk in Holy Orders High Court Pet Dec 1 Ord Jan 6
 MORRIS, CHRISTOPHER THOMAS, Llanwornno, Glam, Painter Aberdare Pet Jan 5 Ord Jan 5
 NEWHAM, FRANK SADDLER, Sutton on the Hill, Farmer Derby Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6
 NIXON, THOMAS, Reading, Surgeon Reading Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6
 OKEILL, JOSEPH, Liverpool, Contractor Liverpool Pet Sept 20 Ord Jan 5
 PARKER, ALBERT, Batley, Yorks, Ironmonger Dewsbury Pet Nov 25 Ord Jan 2
 PHARAOH, JAMES DAWSON, Carnforth, Innkeeper Preston Pet Jan 4 Ord Jan 4
 REECH, JOHN WOOD, Liverpool, Draper Liverpool Pet Dec 30 Ord Jan 6
 ROUSE, CHARLES EDWIN, Liveredge, Currier Dewsbury Pet Nov 27 Ord Jan 2
 ROWLEY, SAMUEL, Birmingham, Commission Agent Birmingham Pet Dec 27 Ord Jan 4
 RUGHAN, FREDERICK, Hewelsfield, Glos, Farmer Newport, Mon Pet Dec 29 Ord Jan 4
 RUTTY, JOHN DUDLEY, Hammersmith rd High Court Pet Nov 30 Ord Jan 4
 SAUNDERS, GEORGE, Yazor, Hereford, Carpenter Hereford Pet Jan 5 Ord Jan 5
 STRIDE, JAMES WILLIAM, Brighton, Auctioneer Brighton Pet Oct 10 Ord Jan 6
 TAYLOR, GEORGE JOHNROX, Handsworth, Electro plate Manufacturer Birmingham Pet Jan 2 Ord Jan 4
 WALFORD, FRANCES JOHN, Box, Wilts, Grocer Bath Pet Jan 6 Ord Jan 6
 YOUNG, LEVI H., Threadneedle st High Court Pet Nov 7 Ord Jan 4

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of the 15th Dec:-
 BEDINGFIELD, JAMES, Beddingfield, Suffolk, Farmer Ipswich Pet Dec 9 Ord Dec 9

ORDER RESCINDING RECEIVING ORDER AND DISMISSING PETITION.

WILSON, JOSEPH HAVELOCK, Harold st, Camberwell, M.P. High Court Pet Aug 31 Rec Ord Nov 20 Rescued and Dismissal Jan 4

SALE OF ENSUING WEEK.

Jan. 17.—Mr. C. RAWLEY CROSS, at the Mart, E.C., at 2 o'clock, Freehold and Leasehold Shop Property (see advertisement, this week, p. 2).

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

Corporation Robes, University and Clergy Gowns

ESTABLISHED 1859.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

